

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, 22nd November 1955.

The House met in the Assembly Chamber, Government Estate, Mount Road, at nine of the clock, Mr. Speaker (THE HON. SRI N. GOPALA MENON) in the Chair.

I.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS.

Reorganization of States

* 2698 Q.—SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state whether the Government have appointed any Special Officer to work out the preliminary details for the separation of Malabar and South Kanara from the Madras State?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : No, Sir.

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : May I know whether, now that partition is more or less certain, any representative from among the Malabar M.L.As. would be appointed to any *ad hoc* committee to go into departmental data before partition is effected?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : We have not gone into the question of appointing Committees or Special Officers for this purpose. As soon as decisions are taken with regard to partition, then the necessary administrative machinery will be set up.

* 2699 Q.—SRI K. P. GOPALAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Madras Government have made any suggestions to the States Reorganization Commission regarding the formation of "Dakshina Samasthanam"; and

(b) if so, whether a copy of the suggestions made will be placed on the table of the House?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

SRI K. P. GOPALAN : May I know from the Hon. Minister whether the Government have submitted any memorandum in connexion with the formation of the linguistic States especially the formation of Aikya Kerala, Aikya Karnataka and Aikya Tamilagam States?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : We submitted a memorandum to the State Reorganization Commission when they requested the various State Governments to send their recommendations and that is the only representation we have made.

[22nd November 1955]

SRI K. P. GOPALAN : When the Government submitted a memorandum to the States Reorganization Commission, may I know from the Hon. Minister why they did not place the proposals of the Government before this Assembly? Is it right on the part of the Government to submit a memorandum like that without informing this House?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : The Government have certain responsibility and they presume that this House has got confidence in the Government making certain representations. It is only in pursuance of that that they have made recommendations. If the people have no confidence in the Government it is open to them to take such steps as they like.

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : Certain representations must have been made by the Malayala Pradesh Congress Committee or by responsible committees inside the Congress from Malabar. Have the Government, on such representations, expressed any opinion about the feasibility or otherwise, willingness or otherwise for the formation of Dakshina Samasthanam or Dakshina Pradesh?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sir, that matter did not come up for consideration before the Government at all, because they perhaps sent their recommendations direct to the States Reorganization Commission.

SRI S. PANCHAKSHARAM : The speech of the Hon. Leader of the House which has been placed in our hands contains all the proposals that the Government are taking up with the Central Government. I wish to know whether the proposals made by this Government to the States Reorganization Commission are in consonance with the proposals contained in the speech delivered yesterday by the Hon. Leader of the House? Or they are something different?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I am not able to follow the trend of the question.

SRI S. PANCHAKSHARAM : The speech of the Hon. Leader of the House delivered yesterday is placed in our hands and it contains the proposals which the Government are going to make to the Centre. Previously the Government also have submitted proposals to the States Reorganization Commission. Are these two proposals similar or are there any differences between the original proposals and the proposals now made?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sir, I cannot say whether it is word for word the same. Anyhow there has been no departure in any fundamental aspect.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : Now that we are discussing the States Reorganization Commission's Report, and that the Government have made their stand clear, will the Government be pleased to supply us with the original report at least before the discussion on this concludes?

22nd November 1955]

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : It was a representation made to the Commission and without their concurrence I think we cannot supply copies of the memorandum to the hon. Members.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : Am I correct in concluding that this Government of Madras is against the formation of Dakshina Samasthanam as it is called?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : There is no question of its being against or for. That question does not arise at all.

Shoranur Metal Industries, Ltd.

* 2700 Q.—**SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have decided to re-open the Shoranur Metal Industries, Limited, South Malabar; and

(b) if so, under what conditions?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : (a) & (b) The Government will sanction a further loan of one lakh of rupees on the assets of the company on condition that the company resumes work under a new Board of Management; and the shareholders of the company are taking active steps for early resumption of work.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : May I know whether in pursuance of that, the company has actually started work or whether it is still in the process of being started?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : I am sorry, Sir, I do not have with me any up-to-date information about it.

SRI K. P. GOPALAN : May I know from the Hon. Minister whether the Government will direct the new management of the company when it is re-started to take back the old workers into the service of the company according to the service they have put in if they wished to re-join it?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : That is a separate question and that will be looked into.

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : Now that the Government finances are going into the industry, would the Government insist among the conditions to be imposed that the Labour Union which is vitally interested in the running of that industry should also be given a share in its management?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : I do not think the Government are considering any such proposal.

[22nd November 1955]

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : Sir, very often there is a very great time lag between the preparation of the answers and the time they are given before the House. In the meantime, the situation changes. May I know with reference to what date the information is given by the Hon. Minister?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : This is dated 20th September.

SRI M. KALYANA SUNDARAM : பல வருஷங்களாக இந்தத் தொழிலாளர்கள் வேலையில்லாமல் இருந்திருக்கிறார்கள். இந்தத் தொழிற்சாலை திறக்கப்பட்டதா என்ற விவரமே கனம் மந்திரி அவர்களுக்குத் தெரியவில்லை. தொழிற்சாலை திறக்கப்படும்போது வேலை இழந்தவர்களுக்கு நஷ்டஈடு கொடுக்கப்படவேண்டுமென்ற விஷயம் கவனிக்கப்படுமா?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : தொழில் தகராறு சட்டத்தின் பிரிவுகளின்கீழ் என்ன என்ன செய்யமுடியுமோ அவை எல்லாம் செய்யப்படும்.

Opening of Local Fund Dispensaries

9-10
a.m.

* 2701 Q.—**SRI K. MADHAVAN NAMBIAR :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Malabar District Board has applied to the Government for sanction to open two Local Fund dispensaries at Irikkoor and Andathode; and

(b) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The matter is under the consideration of Government.

* 2702 Q.—**SRI K. C. GOPALAN UNNI :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether any request was made to the Government by the people of Thiruvaznamkunnu and Alanallur in Walluvanad taluk, Malabar, in 1954 through the Minister for Agriculture that the Medical Officer in charge of the Local Fund Dispensary, Mannarghat, should visit Alanallur also at least twice or thrice a week; and

(b) if so, the action taken by the Government in the matter?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

SRI K. C. GOPALAN UNNI : Sir, I am surprised to note that the answer to clause (a) of the question is 'No'. It was I who personally gave the memorandum to the Hon. Minister when he came to Thiruvaznamkunnu. I do not know whether the Hon. Minister has misplaced it. I wish to know whether the Government have received the memorandum.

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : The President, District Board, Malabar, and the District Medical Officer, Malabar, have reported that there is no proposal under their consideration for the opening of a part-time dispensary at Alanallur to be visited

22nd November 1955]

by the Medical Officer in charge of the Local Fund Dispensary, Mannarghat. I wonder how the hon. Member thought of the matter.

SRI K. C. GOPALAN UNNI: Sir, the answer to clause (a) was "No". My question is whether the Government have received the memorandum through the Hon. Minister.

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY: I have already answered that.

* 2703 Q.—SRI M. K. PADMAPRABHA GOUNDAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state the action taken by the Government in regard to the opening of a hospital at Vellamunda on the representation, dated 7th June 1952, from the Panchayat Board, Vellamunda, and Memorandum No. PM/481, dated 9th December 1952, from Sri M. K. Padmaprabha Goundar, M.L.A.?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY: The Government issued orders in April 1954 sanctioning the opening of a Government Dispensary at Vellamunda with the necessary staff and equipment as soon as the Village Hospital Committee at Vellamunda constructs a building for accommodating the dispensary and hands it over to the Department as promised.

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR: Sir, may I know whether the process of starting the dispensary is anywhere within sight?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY: Sir, it is reported that the Village Hospital Committee has not yet taken up the construction of the building.

Harijan-Landlord dispute

* 2704 Q.—SRI A. RATNAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state:

(a) the causes for the recent dispute between the Harijans and Landlords of Mahadanapuram, Karur taluk, Tiruchirappalli district;

(b) whether this dispute has been settled by the Collector of Tiruchirappalli;

(c) if so, on what terms and conditions; and

(d) whether the Harijans have boycotted caste Hindus and have refused to do any service to them?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU: (a) to (d) The answer^a is placed on the table of the House.

[22nd November 1955]

SRI S. RAMALINGAM : சமீபத்தில் கனம் முதல் மந்திரி அவர்கள் நிலச்சுவான்தார்க்கும் விவசாயிகளும் சாகுபடி மக்களுக்கும் சரிபாதியாகப் பிரித்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டுமென்று சட்டம் கொண்டுவரப்போவதாக பல இடங்களில் பேசியிருக்கிறார்கள். ஆனால் ரெவின்யூ டிவிஷனல் ஆபீஸர் அவர்கள் செய்து கொடுத்திருக்கக்கூடிய ஒப்பந்தம் இந்தக் கொள்கைக்கு முறனாக இருக்கிறது. ஆகவே அந்த மசோதாவை சர்க்கார் எப்போது சட்டசபையில் கொண்டுவர உத்தேசித்திருக்கிறார்கள் என்று கனம் மந்திரி அவர்களைக் கேட்க விரும்புகிறேன்.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : இனி வரப்போகும் மசோதாவுக்கும் இப்போது ரெவின்யூ டிவிஷனல் ஆபீஸர் செய்து கொண்டிருக்கும் ஒப்பந்தத்திற்கும் யாதொரு தொடர்பும் இல்லை. இனி புதுச் சட்டம் வந்தால் அப்போது எல்லாம் வேறுவிதமாக அமைக்கப்படும்.

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN : Sir, has the Revenue Divisional Officer who effected the settlement been transferred from Karur and if so, whether one of the reasons for his transfer was that he effected a successful settlement between the two parties alleged to be injurious to the landlords?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : I repudiate the implication, Sir. Transfers are being made. There is a well-known Tamil saying "the crow sitting on the palmyra tree and the fruit falling". It is probably something like that that is in the mind of the hon. Member.

Construction of a dam at Alemtherpattu in Vriddhachalam taluk

* 2705 Q.—**SRI M. KATTIMUTHU :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state :

(a) whether the Government have received the resolution passed at the Agricultural Conference held in Vriddachalam on 9th January 1955 regarding the construction of a dam at Alemtherputtu channel in Vriddachalam taluk and undertaking of work in Nemam lake for irrigation purposes; and

(b) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI R. SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI : (a) Yes.

(b) An extract of the resolution was forwarded to the Special Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, for necessary action. It has been reported that the proposal will be investigated. Necessary action will be taken by the Government on receipt of proposals after investigation.

Prohibition offences

* 2706 Q.—**SRI N. K. PALANISAMY :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Religious Endowments and Transport be pleased to state the steps taken by the Government—

(i) to reduce the incidence of offences under the Prohibition Act; and

22nd November 1955]

(ii) to improve the health of those who are addicted to illicit arrack?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : (i) The following steps have been taken to reduce the incidence of offences under the Madras Prohibition Act :—

(1) The Police and Prohibition staff are constantly hammering at crime spots by frequent raid and concentrating their attention to eliminate the sources of crime.

(2) Informants are set up and granted rewards to come forward with useful information to unearth crime.

(3) District Advisory Councils and Taluk Prohibition Committees are formed and they are working in all districts. The co-operation of the public is enlisted through these agencies and the crime position is reviewed by the above committees at periodical intervals.

(4) The Enforcement staff are pressing for deterrent punishments in courts for Prohibition offenders.

(5) Mobile squads are posted at District Headquarters serving as a striking force to detect Prohibition offences.

(6) Intensive patrolling of sweet juice topes are regularly conducted by the enforcement staff to prevent illicit tapping of trees.

(7) All trains are regularly watched and checked by the platform and Railway Police constables and offenders caught are prosecuted.

(8) Railway vigilance Committees have been established in all important stations and the members are giving active co-operation in detection of offenders.

(9) To reduce the incidence of offences by the members of jaggery co-operatives who are granted licences to tap palm trees for sweet juice for manufacture of jaggery under the Madras Sweet Toddy Rules, the Inspectors of Co-operative Department who issue the licences, fix a reasonable quantity of jaggery to be produced by each society or tapper member per week or fortnight on the basis of palm trees tapped, taking into consideration the local and seasonal conditions also. The licences of those who produce less than the prescribed quantity of jaggery are liable to be cancelled. To watch the quantity of sweet juice drawn and the jaggery manufactured by the licensees, the jaggery societies are required to maintain the necessary registers which are scrutinised by the Inspectors in charge of the societies and the Palm Gur Instructors at the time of their visits.

(ii) No special steps have been taken to improve the health of those who are addicted to illicit arrack, but it is open to addicts who fall ill to attend Government Hospitals.

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : Sir, would the Hon. Minister agree to add among the grounds used for reducing the incidence of prohibition offences one more policy that has been consistently

[22nd November 1955]

adopted by this Government, namely the virtual non-enforcement of the Madras Prohibition Act among the people and will Government consider another suggestion that I have to make, namely, to carry on a campaign among the police force to stop prohibition offences among themselves?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : The Government know their duty, Sir.

SRI S. PANCHAKSHARAM : Sir, from the figures furnished to the District Prohibition Committees we find that the police are able to haul up only individual offenders. Will the Government consider the proposal of raiding production centres so that prohibition offences may be put an end to very strictly?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : I would suggest to the hon. Member to write to me. I will examine the question in detail.

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM : Sir, the Hon. Minister was saying that periodically the Government are reviewing the position relating to prohibition offences. What is the result of such reviews? Is the crime on the increase or on the decrease? What are the reasons for the increase? What action do the Government propose to take to reduce the offences?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : The answer to the next question will indicate the steps that are taken by the Government.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : In view of the increase in the number of prohibition offences from month to month in almost all the districts of the State, will the Government consider the feasibility of revising their prohibition policy?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : That cannot be done Sir.

SRI N. K. PALANISAMY : சென்னை ராஜ்யத்தைப்பற்றி திட்டக் கமிஷனுக்கு அனுப்பியுள்ள பதிலில் குடிப்பதினால் இந்த மாகாணத்தில் அதிகப்பேருடைய தேகநிலை பாதிக்கப்பட்டிருப்பதாகக் கூறப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. அப்படியானால் எவ்வளவு பேர் அவ்விதம் பாதிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறார்கள் என்பதைக் கண்டுபிடித்து, ஏதாவது மருந்து கொடுத்து அவர்களுடைய தேகநிலையைச் சரிப்படுத்துவதற்கு சர்க்கார் நடவடிக்கை எடுத்திருக்கிறார்களா ?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : நான் ஒரு நீண்ட பதில் சொன்னேன். அதில் என்ன என்ன நடவடிக்கைகள் எடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள் என்பது கொடுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது.

SRI V. GOPALA GOUNDER : Pondicherry is now merged with the Indian Union. As the Prohibition Act is not in force in Pondicherry, liquor is sold there without any restriction. Liquor purchased in Pondicherry is smuggled into the Indian Union. Is there any special staff to check this smuggling and, if not, will the Government employ the necessary staff to prevent smuggling?

22nd November 1955]

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : There is staff to check the smuggling of liquor or arrack from Pondicherry into this State.

SRI B. K. NALLASWAMI : ஸார், மாமூல் வழக்கம் அதிகமாக ஏற்பட்ட இடங்களில் மதுவிலக்கு ஒழுங்காக நடைபெறவில்லை. இப்பொழுது மாமூல் குடிகாரர்களிடத்தில் இருப்பதால் குடிகாரர்களல்லாதவர்கள் தொந்தரவு செய்யப்படுகிறார்கள் என்பது சர்க்காருக்குத் தெரியுமா? அப்படி ஏதாவது புகார் வந்திருந்தால் அந்த மாமூல் வழக்கத்தை ஒழிப்பதற்கு சர்க்கார் என்ன நடவடிக்கை எடுக்க உத்தேசித்திருக்கிறார்கள்?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : மாமூல் வழக்கம் என்ன என்பது தெரியவில்லை. அப்படி எங்கேயாவது இருந்தால் பொது ஜனங்களுடைய ஒத்துழைப்பு இருந்தால் அதை ஒழிக்க முடியும்.

SRI K. ARANGANATHAN : Prohibition work is reviewed once in two months. Will the Government convene a meeting of the District Prohibition Committee once every month so that the members could make suggestions for enforcing the Prohibition Act strictly?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : Government have received complaints that members do not attend the Prohibition Committee meetings in certain districts. Therefore the Government thought that it would be sufficient if the meetings are held five or six times in a year. In districts where the members show enthusiasm, I shall ask the Collector to hold the meeting once a month.

SRI V. C. PALANISWAMI GOUNDER : May I know whether the Government are considering the necessity for amending the Prohibition Act suitably so as to check the growing offences?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : That is under the consideration of this Government as well as the Central Government.

SRI S. DAIVASIGAMONEY : It has been brought out by the Government Analyst in his report that various tinctures, which are not used now-a-days, for medicinal purposes, are being manufactured for use as intoxicants. Will the Government take steps to restrict the manufacture of these tinctures?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : They have already taken steps.

SRI M. PALANIYANDI : ஸார், மதுவிலக்குக் குற்றத்தைப்பற்றி நீண்ட ஒரு அறிக்கையை மந்திரி அவர்கள் படித்தார்கள். திருட்டுத்தனமாக காய்ச்சுவதை தடுக்க நடவடிக்கை எடுப்பதுபற்றியும் தெரிவித்தார்கள். மீண்டும் மதுவிலக்குக் குற்றங்கள் அதிகமாக இருப்பதைப்பற்றியும் குறிப்பிட்டார்கள். அதற்குக் காரணம் போலீஸ்காரர்களுக்கு குறைவான சம்பளம் கொடுப்பதா, அப்படி இருந்தால் அந்த அடிப்படையில் அவர்களுக்கு சம்பளத்தை உயர்த்திக் கொடுக்க சர்க்கார் முன்வருவார்களா? சாதாரணமாக போலீஸ்காரர்கள் தங்களுடைய உயிரை திருணமாக மதித்து மதுவிலக்குக்குற்றங்களைக் கண்டு பிடிக்கும்பொழுது அவர்கள் பல

[22nd November 1955]

கஷ்டங்களுக்கு ஆளாகிறார்கள். அப்படி மதுவிலக்குக் குற்றங்களை கண்டு பிடித்தாலும் அவர்களுக்கு வேண்டிய வெகுமானம் கொடுப்பது இல்லை. மேல் அதிகாரிகள் அனுதாபமும் காட்டுவதாக இல்லை. உதாரணமாக திருச்சியில் பாலக்கரை ஸ்டேஷனைச் சேர்ந்த போலீஸ்காரர் ஒரு குற்றவாளியைக் கண்டு பிடிக்கும்போது குத்தப்பட்டார். அதற்கு மேலதிகாரிகள் நடவடிக்கை எடுத்ததாக தெரியவில்லை. அதனால் அந்த அடிப்படையில் அவர்களுடைய சம்பளத்தை உயர்த்தியும் அவர்களுடைய வாழ்க்கைத் தரத்தை உயர்த்தியும் கொடுக்க சர்க்கார் முன் வருமா?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : எப்பொழுது போலீஸ் அதிகாரிகள் திருட்டுத்தனமாக காய்ச்சுவதைக் கண்டு பிடிக்கிறார்களோ அப்பொழுதெல்லாம் அவர்களுக்கு வேண்டிய வெகுமானம் கொடுக்கப் பட்டுத்தான் வருகிறது.

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN : Sir, are not anti-prohibitionists like my gallant Friend Mr. Vinayakam exaggerating the situation with a view to break down prohibition?

SRI S. R. ARUMUGAM : கள்ளச் சாராயம் காய்ச்சுகின்றவர்கள் வெள்வேலா மரப்பட்டையிலிருந்துதான் காய்ச்சுகிறார்கள். அதனால் அந்த மரத்தை வெட்டாமல் இருக்கும்படியான தடை உத்தரவை சர்க்கார் போடுவார்களா? விறகு கடைகளில் கூட அந்த மரத்தை வெட்டி வந்து விற்கக்கூடாது என்ற ஒரு உத்தரவையும் சர்க்கார் போடுவார்களா? ஆகவே அந்த மரத்தை வெட்டக்கூடாது என்ற தடை உத்தரவைப்போட சர்க்கார் உத்தேசிக்குமா?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : சாதாரணமாகவே உத்தரவு இல்லாமல் மாங்களை வெட்டக்கூடாது என்று ஏற்கெனவே உத்தரவு இருக்கிறது. இதற்கு என்று தனிப்பட்ட உத்தரவு போடவேண்டியதில்லை. பொது மக்கள் ஒத்துழைத்து மாங்களை வெட்டாமல் இருந்தால் போதும். அப்படி பொது மக்கள் வெட்டாமல் இருந்து அரசாங்கத்திற்கு உதவி செய்ய வேண்டும்.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : The little enthusiasm evidenced by the members of the Committee is due to the mechanical way in which the Government appoint those members. Will the Government see that persons who have real faith in prohibition or are enthusiastic about prohibition are appointed to the committees?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : It is a reflection on the members of the Committees. Will the hon. Member point out any member of the Committee who has no faith in prohibition?

SRI S. RAMALINGAM : மதுவிலக்கு அட்வைசரி கமிட்டிக்கு கூட்டத்திற்கு பல அங்கத்தினர்கள் சரியாக வருவதில்லை என்று மந்திரி சொன்னார். அதற்குக் காரணம் அந்த அங்கத்தினர்களுக்கு மதுவிலக்கு திட்டத்தில் நம்பிக்கையில்லையா அல்லது மது விலக்கு குற்றம் சம்பந்தமாக சர்க்கார் எடுக்கும் நடவடிக்கை போதாது என்ற காரணத்தினாலா அல்லது கூட்டத்தில் அவர்கள் சொல்லக்கூடியவைகளையும் நிறைவேற்றும் தீர்மானங்களையும் சர்க்கார் ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளாத காரணத்தினாலா? அவர்கள் எதனால் கூட்டங்களுக்கு சரியாக வரவில்லை என்பதை சர்க்கார் அறிவார்களா?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : எவ்வளவோ காரணங்கள் இருக்கலாம். அங்கத்தினர்கள் சில கமிட்டிகளுக்கு வருவதில்லை என்று சம்பந்தப்பட்ட கலெக்டர்கள் அரசாங்கத்திற்குத் தகவல் கொடுத்திருக்

22nd November 1955]

கிறார்கள். ஆனால் என்ன தீர்மானம் நிறைவேற்றினாலும் அது நியாயமானதாக இருந்தால் அதை அரசாங்கம் அங்கீகரித்து தக்க நடவடிக்கை எடுத்துக்கொண்டுதானிருக்கிறார்கள்.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : Is the Minister aware of the fact that the bulk of public opinion is against the present prohibition policy of our Government? In the event of the Government not revising that policy, will they be pleased at least to appoint a non-official committee to go into the question of, and advise the Government on, enforcing the policy strictly or dropping it altogether?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : Putting of such questions on the floor of the House does not conduce to the creation of that amount of enthusiasm that is necessary among the members. I do not at all agree that the bulk of public opinion is against prohibition. I am quite sure that prohibition is becoming a success day by day.

SRI V. MUTHU : ஸார், கனம் மந்திரி அவர்களுடைய பதிலிலிருந்து வெள்ளேலா மரப்பட்டையிலிருந்துதான் கள்ளச் சாராயம் காய்ச்சுவதாகத் தெரிகிறது. அந்த மரங்களை அனுமதியின்றி வெட்டக்கூடாது என்றும் சொன்னார். எப்படிப்பட்ட தடையிருந்தாலும் திருட்டுத்தனமாகத்தான் வெட்டி வருவார்கள். ஆகையால் அப்படிப்பட்ட மரங்களை நாட்டில் இல்லாமல் அழித்துவிடுவது நல்லது அல்லவா? அதற்கு வேண்டிய ஏற்பாட்டை அரசாங்கம் செய்வார்களா? மூல பொருள் இருந்தால்தானே அந்த மரத்தை வெட்டி காய்ச்சுவார்கள். அதனால் அந்த மரம் இல்லாமலேயே ஒழித்துவிடலாம் அல்லவா? இப்பொழுது மரங்கள் நட்டுக் கொண்டு வருகிறோம். அதனால் இந்த மரங்களே இல்லாமல் ஒழித்து விடலாம் அல்லவா?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : கள்ளச் சாராயம் காய்ச்சுகிறவர்கள் எப்படியாவது காய்ச்சிக்கொண்டு தானிருப்பார்கள். அதற்கு மரம் இருக்கவேண்டும் அல்லது இல்லாமல் இருக்கவேண்டும் என்பது இல்லை. பொது ஜனங்களுடைய ஒத்துழைப்புதான் வேண்டும். அவர்களுடைய ஆதரவு இருந்தால் மதுவிலக்கு வெற்றி கரமாக நடக்கும்.

SRI K. ARANGANATHAN : எந்தெந்த ஜில்லாக்களில் அங்கத் தினர்கள் மதுவிலக்குக் கமிட்டிக் கூட்டங்களுக்கு வரவில்லை என்பது மந்திரிக்குத் தெரியுமா? பல கூட்டங்கள் அசெம்பிளி செஷன் நடக்கும்போது கூட்டப்படுவதால் அந்தக் கூட்டங்களுக்கு எம்.எல்.ஏ.க்கள் போக முடிவதில்லை என்பது அரசாங்கத்திற்கு தெரியுமா?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : இதைப்பற்றி தனிகேள்வி போட்டால் எந்தெந்த அங்கத்தினர்கள் எந்தெந்த கூட்டங்களுக்கு வரவில்லை என்பதைச் சொல்லுகிறேன்.

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : May I know whether the Government will try any alternative method of tackling prohibition as against the present method of tackling it at the khaki level and putting the campaign on a crusade basis? Will the Hon. the Minister be pleased to convene and address people's conferences instead of opening more prohibition stations?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : I expect the co-operation of the hon. Members, particularly the Member who puts a question like this. We are expecting the report of the Indian Prohibition Committee which will greatly help us in carrying on our work.

[22nd November 1955]

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM : Usually, Prohibition Committee meetings are held at the district headquarters. If the meetings are held in other places, it will be possible for the members of the committee to address public meetings and educate the people in the cause of prohibition, after the committee meetings are over. Therefore will the Government issue instructions for the holding of the Prohibition Committee meetings in such places?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : I will examine that suggestion.

(Question Nos. 2707 and 2708 answered together.)

Prohibition offences

* 2707 Q.—**SRI A. RATNAM :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Religious Endowments and Transport be pleased to state—

(a) the number of persons arrested for Prohibition offences in the State during the year 1954-55 and the number of women offenders;

(b) the percentages of increase in Prohibition crime in 1954-55 as compared with that of the previous two years; and

(c) the annual expenditure incurred in enforcing the Prohibition Act and the cost of maintenance of Prohibition Department?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : (a) 1,03,796 and 7,360 respectively.

(b) 21.5 per cent and 20 per cent increase, as compared with Prohibition offences in 1952-53 and 1953-54, respectively; and

(c) Rs. 37.79 lakhs during 1954-55. This excludes the expenditure incurred in the Police Prohibition districts and also in the Excise Prohibition districts transferred to the Police department from 3rd January to 31st March 1955 for which separate figures are not available.

* 2708 Q.—**SRI M. S. MOGRAL :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Religious Endowments and Transport be pleased to state—

(a) the number of persons charge-sheeted for offences under the Prohibition Act in the years 1953-54 and 1954-55 in South Kanara district; and

(b) the number convicted.

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : (a) The number of persons charge-sheeted in 1953-54 and 1954-55 is 2,359 and 4,126, respectively.

(b) The number of persons convicted in 1953-54 and 1954-55 is 1,929 and 3,171, respectively.

22nd November 1955]

Adult schools.

* 2709 Q.—SRI A. RATNAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state why the Government are not at present running any adult schools in the State?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: Even previously, the Government were not running adult schools themselves. While all adult schools were admitted to Government aid previously, now grants are confined to the adult schools in areas covered by the Community Projects and the National Extension Service.

Improvement of cattle wealth

* 2710 Q.—SRI A. RATNAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) the amount spent for improvement of cattle wealth in the State in the year 1954-55;

(b) the establishment charges incurred by the Government during that year; and

(c) the terms of appointment of the Milk Commissioner for improving cattle wealth?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM: (a) The portion of the expenditure incurred by the Animal Husbandry Department on improvement of cattle is estimated at about Rs. 28 lakhs.

(b) The establishment charges come to Rs. 8,28,848.

(c) The Government have not appointed a Milk Commissioner. They have sanctioned the creation of the post of a Special Officer for Milk in the grade of a District Veterinary Officer to correlate the work relating to the formation of Milk Colonies and to tackle the milk supply question in the Madras City.

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR: Would Government consider expenditure upon cattle welfare by also making a grant to Gosadans in the State?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM: The Government have also been giving in a way such help.

Medical supply to Local Board Medical Institutions

* 2711 Q.—SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Malabar District Board and some other Local Board Institutions requested the Government to allow them to purchase their medical supplies from sources other than the Medical Stores Depot, Madras; and

(b) if so, whether the request was granted?

[22nd November 1955]

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : (a) The Malabar District Board only applied to the Government for permission to purchase medical supplies from sources other than the Medical Stores Depot.

(b) No, Sir.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : Many local board dispensaries under district boards are without proper medicines on account of this system of purchase under which very often replies to their demand are received as "hereafter medicines"? Therefore, will the Government see that in such cases, as in the headquarters hospitals, these hospitals are also allowed to purchase medicines at least to a limited extent so that the patients may have their medicines in proper time?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : The Government have made inquiries into this matter and they understand from the Assistant Inspector-General that indents are complied with to a maximum of 80 per cent and for the remaining items that could not be supplied, intimation is being sent to the indentors direct within two months' time from the date of the indent.

SRI K. P. GOPALAN : In many of the rural dispensaries, even though the amount sanctioned is very meagre, it takes six months to one year for the medicines to reach them. So, will the Government be pleased to give instructions or to grant permission to the local board dispensary doctors or district boards to purchase medicines locally? Otherwise, the people will suffer. So, will the Government take a definite stand on this matter?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : The hon. Member is probably referring to what was happening some time ago. But now the indents are attended to better. 80 per cent of the indents are complied with. Where the medicines are not available in the Medical Stores, it is open to the authorities concerned to buy them in the local market.

SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN : May I know whether the Madras Medical Stores Depot is supplying medicines to district boards at a concessional rate? If not, why are the Government insisting that all the district boards shall buy medicines from the Madras Medical Stores Depot? Because they are forced to buy medicines from the Madras Medical Stores Depot, the conveyance charges or transport charges make the medicines more costly and this also causes great inconvenience to the public. In view of all these things, will the Government relax their present directive in the matter?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : No concessional rates are charged. But the rates charged by the Medical Stores may sometimes be higher or cheaper than the prevailing market rates. It is always safer to buy the medical requisites from the Medical Stores because they can be depended upon to be pure and genuine. Sub-standard drugs and spurious drugs are so widely sold now. It is not safe always to buy them in markets.

22nd November 1955]

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : While the last point can be obviated by marking out the companies from which the local boards or the local board hospitals could buy their medicines, may I know whether this year any special instructions have been issued to expedite sanctions because I know last year there was a scandalous instance wherein for six months or more there was no medicine except acqua which could also be treated as medicine, in a particular hospital, namely, the Kuthuparamba hospital and people had to subscribe for purchase of medicine and the doctor was just giving it so that he may not keep himself idle? So, may I know whether the Government will cut out red tape and allow papers to be disposed of at the district level instead of their having to travel all the way to Madras and slumber in the particular depot, the depot of the Government?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : About the particular instance mentioned by the hon. Member, he may kindly write to me; I shall have inquiries made. About the lack of medicines in the dispensaries under district boards, it may be due to their deficit budgets rather than merely to the delay caused by the Medical Stores in supplying the medicines.

SRIMATHI (DR.) T. S. SOUNDARAM RAMACHANDRAN :
எம்.எஸ்.டி. ஸ்டோர்ஸ்களில் மலிவாக கொடுக்கப்படுகிற தென்பது உண்மைதான். இருந்தாலும் நாங்கள் இன்ன மருந்துகள் வேண்டுமென்று கேட்டு எழுதினால் எங்களுக்கு மருந்துகள் வந்து சேர்வதற்குள் மிகுந்த காலம் ஆகிவிடுகின்றது. சில சமயங்களில் டாக்டர்களாகிய நாங்கள் வெட்கப்பட்டக்கூட வேண்டியிருக்கிறது. ஏனென்றால் மிகச் சாதாரணமான மருந்துகள்கூட சில சமயங்களில் கைவசம் இல்லாமல் போய்விடுகின்றது. ஆகவே மிகக் குறைந்த காலத்தில் மருந்துகள் சப்ளை செய்யும்படியாக, சப்ளையை துரிதமாக செய்யும்படியாக அதாவது இரண்டு மாதங்களுக்குள்ளாவது அனுப்பிவைக்கும்படியாக சர்க்கார் ஏற்பாடு செய்ய தக்க நடவடிக்கை எடுக்குமா?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : This matter has been taken up by the Central Council of Health. The Government of India in the Ministry of Health have asked the Medical Stores to be vigilant in this matter and to supply the indents as early as possible.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : Have the State Government any control over these Medical Stores Depots?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : It is run by the Government of India.

SRI V. K. RAMASWAMI MUDALIAR : The Medical Stores Depot knows very well the requirements of all the local board dispensaries in the State. As such, why should it not supply all their requirements every year instead of withholding about 20 per cent of the indents? If it withholds this 20 per cent, it means that it never supplies this 20 per cent at all. So, will the Government issue instructions to the Medical Stores to supply all the medicines every year in time?

[22nd November 1955]

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : 80 per cent which I referred to relates to a period some time back. There is some improvement now.

9-40 a.m. SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAI : Sir, it is very easy to give instructions like the one which the Hon. Minister stated just now asking the Department to be very vigilant. But, what precise steps has the Hon. Minister suggested to remove all these defects?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : The question has been taken up with the Government of India in the Central Ministry of Health.

SRI K. ARANGANATHAN : In spite of suitable instructions from the Central Government, the Medical Stores are not supplying the medicines that are required by the Local Board institutions as early as possible. In South Arcot district, all local fund dispensaries are suffering for want of medicines. Will the Government issue suitable instructions to the authorities concerned to supply them immediately?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : The hon. Member is making a statement without definite information, Sir.

SRI T. ANANTA PAI : Sir, if the Medical Stores fail to supply the requirements within a specified date, could not the Government give necessary authority to the local boards to place indents locally and get their supplies?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : I have already stated that, Sir, in my answer to the question that it is open for the local bodies or the Government hospitals to get their supplies by calling for quotations from reputable firms and getting the medical requisites when the Medical Stores are not able to supply the things wanted.

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR : Sir, with regard to the defects in the supply of drugs, medicines, etc., the Madras Government had appointed an *ad hoc* Committee to go into the question. May I know whether the Government have accepted any of the recommendations of the so-called *ad hoc* Committee appointed for the purpose and if so, what are the recommendations implemented?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : I would like to know which Committee the hon. Member is referring to and when it was appointed.

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR : I refer to the *ad hoc* Committee appointed by the Government in 1949.

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : I have no information about this Committee, Sir.

22nd November 1955]

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : Of course, there are so many Committees and their recommendations are not seriously taken notice of. So, there is absolutely no surprise in the Hon. Minister not knowing the Committee, its recommendations and all that. But, in view of the fact that there is universal complaint from all the districts, from not merely local board hospitals but also from Government hospitals as the hon. Member there pointed out and as I also know that even vital medicines required for tuberculosis are not sometimes supplied in time to the Tellicherry Hospital of whose Advisory Committee I happen to be a Member, would the Government create some kind of apparatus to by-pass this very sluggish Stores?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : A same sort of question is asked in another form. I have already replied that whenever indents cannot be complied with by the Medical Stores, it is open either to the Government Hospital or the local fund dispensary to get medicines locally by getting quotations from reputable firms.

(Questions Nos. 2712, 2713 and 2714 taken up together.)

Land reforms

* 2712 Q.—**SRI K. VINAYAKAM :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state whether the Government are awaiting any instructions from the Central Government to introduce Land Reforms in this State?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : The Government of India have been addressed to give their considered views on the constitutional and legal issues involved in introducing comprehensive land reforms in this State. Their reply is awaited.

* 2713 Q.—**SRI K. C. GOPALAN UNNI :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any directive from the Planning Commission or the Government of India regarding the introduction of Land Reforms in this State;

(b) whether this Government have come to any decision regarding Land Reforms to be introduced in this State; and

(c) if the answers are in the affirmative, what their proposals are?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : (a) No, Sir.

(b) & (c) The Madras Cultivating Tenants Protection Act, 1955, has recently been passed into law. The Government will be introducing shortly a Bill on "Fair Rents". As regards other aspects of Land Reforms the Government of India have been addressed to give their considered views on the constitutional and legal issues involved. Their reply is awaited.

[22nd November 1955]

* 2714 Q.—**SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP** : Will the Hon. the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state whether the Government have come to any definite conclusion on the question of agrarian reforms and if so, what the salient features are?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : The Madras Cultivating Tenants Protection Act, 1955, has recently been passed into law. The Government will be introducing shortly a Bill on "Fair Rents". As regards other aspects of Land Reforms, the Government of India have been addressed to give their considered views on the constitutional and legal issues involved. Their reply is awaited.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : While considering the Tenants Protection Bill, the Hon. Minister stated that the next piece of agrarian reform was being given final touches and will be introduced in that session itself. May I know whether that statement was made without consultation of the constitutional aspect of this Bill and may I know why that Bill at least is not forthcoming?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : Sir, that Bill is almost ready. But the hon. member, as a lawyer should know, that when we come to the final stages, certain legal difficulties do crop up. We are making it all right. I am very much at it. I shall see that the Bill is placed before both Houses of the Legislature shortly.

SRI S. PANCHAKSHARAM : Now that the State is going to be disintegrated and is going to become three States, why not the Government consider the postponement of these land reforms for at least one or two years?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : Sir, that is an aspect of the question worth considering.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : In view of the fact that comprehensive land legislation involves different factors like permanency of the tenancy the share between the landlord and the tenant and the maximum holding which an individual should own, is it true that the Government are now trying to refer this question to the Central Government on the pretext of constitutional sanction from them with the object of making this an election issue for the next General Election?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : Sir, the hon. member is imagining many things which are not really there. Now, a Bill as regards the sharing of the crop will be shortly published. As regards the other aspects, viz., fixation of ceiling and the question of giving pre-emption rights to the tenants, there are certain legal and other difficulties. That has been referred to the Government of India.

SRI K. R. SAMBANDAM : தற்சமயம் கொண்டுவரப்பட்டிருக்கும் விவசாயப் பாதுகாப்புச் சட்டத்தில் தஞ்சாவூரில் இருக்கக்கூடிய விவசாயிகள் மனைக்கட்டிலிருந்து விலக்கப்படுவதைத் தடுப்பதற்கான ஒருவிதமான பாதுகாப்பும் இல்லாத காரணத்தாலும், இன்னும் பலவிதத்திலும்

22nd November 1955]

விவசாயிகள் அங்கே பலவிதத் தொந்தரவுகளுக்குள்ளாகி வருகிறார்கள். அதைத் தடுப்பதற்கு தஞ்சாவூர் பண்ணையாள் பாதுகாப்புச் சட்டத்தில் ஒரு திருத்தத்தைக் கொண்டுவந்து அவர்களையும் இந்த சென்னை விவசாயப் பாதுகாப்புச் சட்டத்தின் பயனையும் அடையும்படியான நிலைமைக்குக் கொண்டுவர சர்க்கார் முயற்சிக்குமா என்று கேட்கிறேன்?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : இப்போது நிறைவேற்றப்பட்ட மசோதா முக்கியமாக விவசாயத்தைப் பற்றியது. இந்த மனைக்கட்டு விஷயம் அலாதியானது. ஆகையால் அதைப்பற்றிய மசோதாவை தனியாகக் கொண்டுவருவது பற்றித்தான் யோசனை செய்யமுடியும்.

SRI K. R. NALLASIVAM : நிலச் சீர்திருத்தச் சட்டம் கொண்டுவரும் வரையில் தீவிரமான பூமிதான இயக்கத்தில் கலந்து கொள்ளுமாறு மத்திய சர்க்காரிடமிருந்து சென்னை சர்க்காருக்கு தகவல் உண்டா?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : I am not aware of any such thing, Sir.

SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAI : May I know, Sir, what particular aspect of land reform is presenting all these difficulties which requires the Government to approach the Central Government as to whether such a proposal would be constitutionally correct?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : I have already answered. It is with regard to the fixing a ceiling and the area to be covered under personal cultivation and the pre-emption rights contemplated to be given to the tenants.

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : Would the Hon. Minister agree to make a clear, unequivocal and firm statement about the date and the nature of the agrarian reforms Bill that will be brought up because it will enable representations being made from Palghat and Chittur for their inclusion in Tamilnad so that they may escape the Malabar Tenancy Act?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : The nature of the question is such that a particular date cannot be given at present.

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM : I do not minimise the difficulties that may arise in bringing forth a land reform like this. But my point is, before the Government are ready with a particular Bill, one Minister goes about in the mufassal and says that a particular Bill is ready and it is coming. While another Minister goes about and says : " What is the use of land reforms. Land reform is not the panacea for all evils ". As a result of these speeches, some unrest is being created in the minds of the public. So, will the Government realise that till everything is ready for presentation in the Assembly, they should not say anything to the people so that the unrest may be avoided.

MR. SPEAKER : I must tell the hon. Member that supplementary questions are intended for elucidating information on facts already mentioned by the Hon. Minister and not giving advice or opinion on facts mentioned.

9-50
a.m.

[22nd November 1955]

SRI M. PALANIYANDI : ஸார், நமது ரிவினியூ மந்திரி அவர்கள் கனம் பஞ்சாட்சரம் செட்டியார் அவர்களுடைய கேள்விக்கு பதில் சொல்லும்போது இந்த மாகாணப் பிரிவினை வரப்போகிறது என்பதை மனதில் வைத்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டும் என்று சொன்னார். மாகாணப் பிரிவினை வந்த பிறகு உண்மையிலேயே நிலச் சீர்திருத்தச் சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டு வரப்போகிறார்களா அல்லது விட்டு விடப்போகிறார்களா என்பதை அறிய விரும்புகிறேன்.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : கனம் அங்கத்தினர் ஏன் இப்பேற்பட்ட சந்தேகம் வைத்துக்கொள்ளுகிறார் என்பது தெரியவில்லை.

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM : On a point of order, Sir. When I put the supplementary question, the Chair stated that I was giving an advice. I may say that it arises out of the answers given by the Hon. Minister. As a result of the speeches made by Ministers in various parts of the State, some sort of unrest is created in the minds of the public. So, I wanted to know whether the Government were aware of that fact. It is a relevant question arising out of the answer given by the Hon. Minister and it is not an unnecessary question.

MR. SPEAKER : I did not say that it was unnecessary. I only stated that the supplementary questions must be confined to the facts mentioned by the Hon. Minister in his reply.

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM : But we have to give some information for the Hon. Minister to answer the question.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : As the question has been raised, I want to answer it, as otherwise it will create a wrong impression. When Ministers go on tour, they are provoked by the addresses given to them and by the speeches made there and they have naturally to reply to them. But if certain Hon. Members draw wrong or incorrect conclusions and if certain newspapers publish wrong statements, I cannot help it.

SRI M. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR : The Hon. Minister has stated that the Bill would be introduced shortly. May I know whether it will cover South Kanara also?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : South Kanara is still a part of the Madras State. When it goes away from this State, then we shall think of it.

SRI S. RAMALINGAM : ஸார், சென்னை ராஜ்ய குடியானவர்கள் பாதுபாப்புச் சட்டம் இந்த ராஜ்யத்தில் சாகுபடி ஆரம்பித்து பல இடங்களில் தகராறுகள் ஏற்பட்ட பிறகு கொண்டுவரப்பட்டது. அதைப்போல பல இடங்களில் அறுவடை ஆகி குழப்பம் ஏற்பட்ட பிறகு சரிவார சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டுவரப்போகிறார்களா அல்லது முன்னதாகவே கொண்டுவரப்போகிறார்களா?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : சட்டம் பொதுவாக ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இம்மாதிரியான சின்ன பிரச்சனைகள் ஏதாவது இருந்தால் அதைத் தனியாகச் சொன்னால் அதை பரிசீலனை செய்யலாம்.

22nd November 1955]

Parambikulam scheme

* 2715 Q.—SRI N. K. PALANISAMY: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that an expert engineer investigated the Parambayar Scheme for Coimbatore district for utilising the water from Travancore-Cochin State and submitted a report to the Collector of Coimbatore between 1947 and 1951 about the scheme;

(b) if so, what his recommendation was about the scheme; and

(c) the cost of the scheme and the districts that would be benefited by it?

THE HON. SRI R. SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI: (a) The Member presumably refers to the question of diversion of the waters of the Parambikulam on the Travancore-Cochin border for the benefit of Coimbatore district. A preliminary examination of this was made by the Public Works Department. No report was submitted to the Collector of Coimbatore.

(b) The Chief Engineer (Irrigation) recommended that the consideration of the scheme might be postponed until the investigation of schemes already taken up had been completed.

(c) The scheme, as formulated in 1947, was estimated to cost about Rs. 4 crores and expected to irrigate 33,608 acres in Pollachi taluk, Coimbatore district.

The scheme as now revised is called the Parambikulam Ar-Uppar-Aliyar Project and is estimated to cost roughly Rs. 32 crores and to irrigate about 2½ lakhs of new area in Udumalpet, Dharapuram and Pollachi taluks and enable the raising the second crop on 27,000 acres under the Aliyar including 20,000 acres in the Travancore-Cochin State.

SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN: May I know who has investigated into this scheme and whether the investigation was made to find out whether it will affect the Peringal Kuthu Hydro-Electric Scheme and the Chalakundipuzha Scheme in the Travancore-Cochin State and future power generation and irrigation schemes to be undertaken in the proposed Kerala State?

THE HON. SRI R. SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI: Our Special Chief Engineer has made a sort of survey not based on actual details. We have also approached the Travancore-Cochin Government for making a complete and detailed investigation and it is for them to say whether it will adversely affect all these schemes, as alleged by the hon. Member.

SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN: On a point of personal explanation, Sir. The Hon. Minister has stated that I have made an allegation. I have not made any allegation. I did not know whether the investigation was made with reference to the facts

[22nd November 1955]

mentioned by me. My suggestion is that a joint investigation by the Engineers of this State as well as Travancore-Cochin State should cover these facts before any decision is arrived at?

THE HON. SRI R. SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI : When detailed investigation is taken up, naturally all these questions will be considered. But we have made only a tentative suggestion and it is for the Travancore-Cochin State to agree to a joint investigation of the scheme when all these matters will be investigated. It is too premature now to say anything.

SRI N. K. PALANISAMY : இந்த திட்டத்தை அமுல் நடத்துவதற்கு அவர்களுடைய பர்மிஷன் வாங்க இந்த சர்க்கார் திருவாங்கூர் சர்க்காலை பல முறை சந்தித்துப் பேசியிருக்கிறார்கள். அது எந்த நிலையில் இருக்கிறது என்பதை அறிய விரும்புகிறேன்.

THE HON. SRI R. SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI : பல முறை பேசினோம் என்று அவர் சொல்லுகிறார். ஆனால் கனம் அங்கத்தினர் சொல்லுவதைப்போல் நாங்கள் சந்தித்துப் பேசவே இல்லை. அவர் அவ்விதம் எப்படிச் சொல்லுகிறார் என்பது தெரியவில்லை. நாங்கள் அவர்களுக்கு எழுதியிருக்கிறோம். அவர்களுடைய பதிலையும் எதிர்பார்த்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிறோம்.

SRI N. K. PALANISAMY : தண்ணீரைக் கொடுக்க முடியாது என்று அவர்கள் சொன்னதாக பத்திரிகையில் பார்த்தேன். அது உண்மையா?

THE HON. SRI R. SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI : நாங்கள் பத்திரிகைகளைப் பார்ப்பது வழக்கம் இல்லை. பத்திரிகைகளில் என்ன வந்தது என்பது எனக்குத் தெரியாது. அவர்கள் நேரடியாக ஒன்றும் பதில் அளிக்கவில்லை.

SRI V. C. PALANISAMI GOUNDER : In the matter of investigating this big Parambikulam scheme, which is one of the major schemes in the Madras State, may I know whether the Government will consider and issue instructions to the Engineering Department to carry the alignment of the Channel to the highest possible level?

THE HON. SRI R. SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI : The scheme itself has not taken a final shape but the hon. Member is anxious about it now.

SRI V. K. PALANISWAMI GOUNDER : ஸார், இந்த பரம்பயார் ஆறுனது சென்னை ராஜ்யத்திலேயே ஆரம்பித்துவருவதால் அந்தத் தண்ணீர் சென்னை ராஜ்யத்தின் தண்ணீர் என்பது சர்க்காருக்குத் தெரியுமா?

10
a.m. **THE HON. SRI R. SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI :** Yes, Sir.

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR : May I know from the Hon. Minister whether he is aware of the reality that we are not

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : What is meant by "we"?

22nd November 1955]

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR : That we the people of Kerala including Travancore and Cochin State are not against the utilization of surplus water that is flowing into the sea if it is a fact? But the point is whether there is any excess water at all? Have our Government found any necessity for having a joint examination? Otherwise, it will be only a one party examination of the question. I wish to know, on what basis the Government have prepared a scheme costing Rs. 32 crores without even knowing whether there is excess water at all?

SRI B. K. NALLALSWAMI : On a point of order, Sir, I wish to know whether any debate is allowed during question time?

THE HON. SRI R. SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI : It is definitely presumed that a very large quantity of water is going to waste into the sea. On that basis we have proposed these things. It is for the Government of Travancore-Cochin State to say that it is not so and that they require the water available. We do not want the water required by them. Not even a drop of water required by them will be taken away by us. But all the waters superfluous to their needs and going to waste into the sea can only be expected to be tapped. Of course, our expectations are based on tentative findings and that I have already told the House. The hon. Member need not excite himself over the fact that we are making a claim fantastically. We are referring the matter to the Planning Commission and it is up to them to accede to our request or not.

SRI P. CHELLATHURAI : திருவாங்கூர்-கொச்சி இராஜ்யத்திற்குப் பயன்படாது. ஆனால் சென்னை இராஜ்யத்திற்கு மிகவும் பயன்படத்தக்க பரம்பையாறு ஆலடி பரம்பையாறு போன்ற திட்டம் போன்றவைகளை திருவாங்கூர்-கொச்சி சர்க்கார் வேண்டுமென்றே எதிர்த்தால், சென்னை அரசாங்கம் எடுக்கப்போகும் நடவடிக்கை எதுவாக இருக்கும் என்று அறியலாமா?

THE HON. SRI R. SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI : இப்பொழுது எல்லாவற்றையுமே மத்திய சர்க்காரால் நியமிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கும் பிளானிங் கமிஷனின் பொறுப்பில் விட்டு வைத்திருக்கிறோம். இம்மாதிரி தகராறுகள் ஏற்படாமல் தடுக்கவே அவர்கள் ஒரு சட்டம் நிறைவேற்றிக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். ஆகவே அந்தச் சட்டத்தின் பிரகாரம் நமக்குச் சேரவேண்டிய திட்டங்களையும் அவர்கள் நிறைவேற்றிக் கொடுப்பார்கள் என்றே நம்புகிறோம்.

MR. SPEAKER : As there are about 50 questions set down for being answered to-day; with the leave of the House I will take fifteen more minutes and finish them.

Harijan Welfare School for Kilputhupattu village

* 2716 Q.—**SRI B. K. NALLASWAMI** (on behalf of Sri M. Venugopala Goundar) : Will the Hon. the Minister for Religious Endowments and Transport be pleased to state with reference to the answer to question No. 750, dated 16th February 1955 the steps taken so far to open a Harijan Welfare School at Kilputhupattu village, Marakkanam firka, Tindivanam taluk?

[22nd November 1955]

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : The Government do not propose to open a school at Kilputhupattu village, South Arcot district, during 1955-56.

Executive Officer, Turaiyur Panchayat

* 2717 Q.—SRI T. SHANMUGAM (on behalf of Sri P. Ranga-swami Reddiar) : Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state—

What are the extraordinary circumstances, if any, for the frequent orders of the transfer and cancellation of the orders of transfer, in the case of the Executive Officer of Turaiyur Panchayat?

THE HON. SRI S. S. RAMASAMY PADAYACHI : The transfer of the Executive Officer, Turaiyur Panchayat to Sendamangalam Panchayat ordered in November 1954, for administrative reasons was cancelled at his personal request. In March 1955, he was transferred to Ariyalur Panchayat but subsequently reposted to Turaiyur in April 1955 on public grounds.

SRI T. SHANMUGAM : ஒரே ஆபீஸர் எத்தனை முறை மாற்றப்பட்டார், அந்த ஆர்டர் எவ்வளவு முறை ரத்து செய்யப்பட்டது?

THE HON. SRI S. S. RAMASAMY PADAYACHI : ஒரு தடவை மாற்றப்பட்டு, ஒரு தடவை ரத்து செய்யப்பட்டது.

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : The Hon. Minister said that the transfer and subsequent cancellation was made on public grounds. May I know whether sometimes private grounds also were taken into consideration?

THE HON. SRI S. S. RAMASAMY PADAYACHI : Yes, Sir, on both grounds.

District Planning Boards

* 2718 Q.—SRI K. KUNHI MOHAMED SHAFEE : Will the Hon'ble the Minister for Finance be pleased to state, with reference to the answer to a supplementary question under question No. 650 answered on 18th July 1953, when the Government propose to constitute a District Planning Board for Malabar?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : A District Planning Board has already been constituted in the district.

* 2719 Q.—SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether District Planning Boards exist in all districts of the State; and

(b) if not, which are the districts where there are no Planning Boards and the reasons therefor?

22nd November 1955]

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

* 2720 Q.—SRI K. C. GOPALAN UNNI : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government propose to constitute a Planning Board for Malabar; and

(b) if so, when?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to starred question No. 2718.

SRI K. KUNHI MOHAMED SHAFEE : May I know the reason for the inordinate delay in constituting a Planning Board for the District of Malabar?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I do not concede that there was any inordinate delay. It was constituted in time so that necessary recommendations for the formulation of the Second Five-Year Plan might be made.

* 2721 Q.—SRI M. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have constituted a Planning Board for South Kanara; and

(b) if not, why?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : (a) Yes, Sir

(b) Does not arise.

American ghee

* 2722 Q.—SRI A. RATNAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) the steps taken by the Government to prevent adulteration of the imported American ghee; and

(b) whether the ghee from UNICEF has been distributed free to any charitable institutions, and if so, the particulars?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : (a) The question of this Government taking any specific steps to prevent adulteration of imported American ghee does not arise as no complaint of adulteration of American ghee has been received by the Government.

(b) The Government have no information.

SRI S. DAIVASIGAMONEY : May I know whether this American ghee has been analysed, and if so, what are the ingredients out of which it is made and whether it is made out of cotton seed or not?

[22nd November 1955]

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : The Nutrition Section of the Public Health Department have made an analysis of this ghee and they tell me that it is not at all harmful.

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : May I know whether the Government are aware that there is wide-spread distribution of American ghee going on through Roman Catholic missions, which is also used by them for religious and other purposes?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : The Government of India have accepted the gift from America. The Regional Director of Food, Government of India, has been distributing it through various institutions like the National Catholic Welfare Conference, New York, the Archbishop of Madras and certain other officers.

SRI A. RATNAM : May I know who are the agencies other than the missionaries in our State and whether the Government have a check over them?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : As I have stated, distribution is done by the Regional Director of Food, Government of India, and not by the Madras Government.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : Are there any political strings attached to this presentation of ghee, Sir?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : I have no idea at all about that, Sir.

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR : As Members of the Estimates Committee, we recently visited some hospitals in the State and we saw this American ghee stocked in the hospitals, but not being used. When questioned as to why they had not been used, we were told that it had been sent for test. May I know from the Hon. Minister what the result of such a test is and whether it is affirmative or negative with regard to its usage?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : The hon. Member may put a separate question to the Hon. Minister for Health.

" Medical aid " for the Vayittiri Panchayat Board

* 2723 Q.—**SRI M. K. PADMAPRABHA GOUNDER :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state the action taken by the Government on the question of " medical aid " referred to in the Memorandum submitted by the Vayittiri Panchayat Board through the Hon. the Chief Minister on 4th May 1955?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : No action was taken as provision of medical aid in rural areas is primarily the responsibility of the local bodies concerned.

22nd November 1955]

Rent Courts in Malabar

* 2724 Q.—SRI K. C. GOPALAN UNNI : Will the Hon. the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government received any representation from the Malabar Pradesh Congress Committee President, Sri P. Vasu Menon or Sri R. Raghava Menon or from any other person or organization in June 1955, that the functions of the Rent Courts in Malabar should be stayed till a legislation on land reforms is passed; and

(b) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : (a) Various representations were received in this regard.

(b) The Government saw no justification for suspending the work of Rent Courts constituted under the Malabar Tenancy Act.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : Recently the High Court has held that a rule framed by the Government in regard to fixation of fair rent is *ultra vires* of the powers of the Government. May I know whether the Government contemplate rectifying it or issuing any further instructions in the matter?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : Some time is required to look into it.

SRI C. H. KANARAN : May I know whether the Government have received any representations from the President of the Malabar Pradesh Congress Committee Sri P. Vasu Menon or from Sri P. Raghava Menon?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : Sir, I said that many representations were received, of which Sri Raghava Menon's must be one. That is my impression.

* 2725 Q.—SRI C. KUNHIRAMA KURUP : Will the Hon. the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the number of cases which have been filed in Rent Courts in Kurumbranad taluk so far; and

(b) of these, how many have been decreed in favour of tenants and how many in favour of jenmis?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : (a) Six thousand, three hundred and thirteen up to 30th June 1955.

(b) Number decreed in favour of tenants—969.

Number decreed in favour of jenmis—13.

Tamil students of the Anantapur Engineering College

* 2726 Q.—SRI N. K. PALANISAMY : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have sent any communication recently to the Andhra Government with regard to the Tamil students of the Engineering College, Anantapur; and

[22nd November 1955]

(b) if so, what is the nature of the communication?

THE HON. SRI R. SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI : (a) & (b) On a representation received from the Madras State students studying in the Engineering College, Anantapur, that the scholarships and fee concessions, which they had been receiving from the composite State were stopped with effect from 1954-55, this Government took up the case with the Government of Andhra and agreed to pay the cost of scholarships and fee concessions granted to Madras State students on a reciprocal basis. These concessions were thereupon continued.

Administration report on the Motor Vehicles Act Administration

* 2727 Q.—SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Religious Endowments and Transport be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Reports on the Administration of the Motor Vehicles Act for the Calendar years 1952, 1953 & 1954 have been published;

(b) if so, when; and

(c) if not, the reasons for the delay?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : (a) The answer is in the affirmative so far as the reports for the years 1952 and 1953 are concerned.

(b) & (c) The reports for 1952 and 1953 were distributed to the Press in the beginning of 1954 and in the middle of 1955, respectively. The report for the year 1954 has just been received and is under review.

Agrarian troubles

* 2728 Q.—SRI N. K. PALANISAMY : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the police arrested 60 men, women and children at Kadayanallur, Tirunelveli district, on 24th March 1955; and

(b) if so, why?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : (a) Only three men were arrested on the said date.

(b) These three persons were arrested, since they trespassed upon the lands, which were in the possession of a local landlord and obstructed the ploughing of the land by the landlord's men.

* 2729 Q.—SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether any complaint was received by the District Superintendent of Police, Tirunelveli, from the Secretary, Vivasayigal Sangam, Tirunelveli, alleging ill-treatment of peasants and

22nd November 1955]

peasant women by the police, while in police custody during March 1955, in connexion with the Satyagraha against eviction from lands in Kadayannallur, Tirunelveli district; and

(b) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The allegations were duly enquired into and found to be not true.

* 2730 Q.—SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether complaints were received by the District Superintendent of Police, Tirunelveli, from the Secretary, District Vivasayigal Sangam, Tirunelveli, alleging that acts of violence, arson and loot are recently in the increase in the taluk of Srivai-kuntam, by goondas hired by some landlords;

(b) the steps taken by the police to maintain law and order in that area; and

(c) how many cases were registered and investigated and with what results?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : (a) The District Superintendent of Police, Tirunelveli, received a petition from the Secretary, District Vivasayigal Sangam, Tirunelveli, citing several instances where the landlords had committed offences against the Kisans.

(b) The police investigated each specific complaint and filed charge-sheets wherever there was sufficient evidence.

(c) Three cases under the Indian Penal Code and 12 cases under section 107, Criminal Procedure Code (Security Proceedings), were registered. One of the Indian Penal Code cases and the Security Proceedings under section 107, Criminal Procedure Code, are pending trial.

Labour dispute in the Ganesan Press, Tirunelveli

* 2731 Q.—SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether any memorandum, dated 13th April 1955, from the Secretary of the Tirunelveli-Palayamkottai Press Labour Union was received by the Government alleging victimization of Press workers by the management of the Ganesan Press, Tirunelveli Junction; and

(b) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The dispute has been referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Madras,

[22nd November 1955]

Loans for water-supply scheme

* 2732 Q.—SRI M. K. PADMAPRABHA GOUNDER : Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether any action has been taken or is proposed to be taken in regard to the request of the Kalpetta and Manantoddy panchayat boards for loans to implement the water-supply scheme; and

(b) if so, what?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : (a) & (b) No request for a loan to implement the water-supply scheme has been made in respect of Manantoddy Panchayat. The Kalpetta Panchayat has suggested a protected water-supply scheme at Kalpetta, half the cost being met by Government as grant and the other half being given as loan to the panchayat. The proposal regarding the provision of protected water-supply to the Kalpetta Panchayat under the Local Development Works Programme is under the consideration of the Collector of Malabar. The question of granting a loan to the panchayat can be considered only after the work is sanctioned.

Industrial co-operatives for Harijan labourers

* 2733 Q.—SRI P. G. MANICKAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state the number of industrial co-operatives started and in operation for the benefit of Harijan labourers?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Nine, Sir.

Payment of salaries to elementary school teachers

* 2734 Q.—SRI K. MADHAVAN NAMBIAR : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any representations from the Aided Elementary School Teachers' Union, Malabar, about the hardships suffered by the teachers of Ponnani taluk on account of the undue delay in payment of their salary for February and March 1955 due to the negligence of certain Sub-Postmasters of Ponnani taluk; and

(b) if so, what action has been taken on the same?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The delay was brought to the notice of the Postal authorities. It was reported that the delay was due to the fact that the scheme was a new one and there was not sufficient staff in the Post offices to cope with the work. The Postal authorities are reported to have taken action to minimise the delay.

22nd November 1955]

State aid to potters

* 2735 Q.—SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any representation, dated 15th February 1955, from the Potters' Union, Manamadurai, for financial aid to acquire land for constructing kilns; and

(b) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) An expenditure not exceeding Rs. 1,800 has been sanctioned towards the cost of acquisition of the land, as requested by the Union.

Joint survey of irrigation and power potential of Travancore-Cochin States and Madras

* 2736 Q.—SRI N. K. PALANISAMY : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether this Government have requested the Planning Commission to institute a joint survey by the two States of Madras and Travancore-Cochin of the irrigation and power potential and to pool the water now going to waste in two reservoirs one on the extreme south of Tirunelveli-Ramanathapuram-Travancore border and other on Coimbatore-Travancore-Cochin border; and

(b) if so, the reply received thereto?

THE HON. SRI R. SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI : (a) This Government have requested the Planning Commission for a joint investigation of the feasibility of diverting waters in some of the west-flowing rivers to the Madras State for the mutual benefit of the Madras and Travancore-Cochin States.

(b) The Planning Commission has stated in its reply that it proposes that schemes in which the diversion of the water looked 'prima facie' advantageous, be investigated by the Central Water and Power Commission with the close collaboration of the State Governments.

Temple entry

* 2737 Q.—SRI A. RATNAM : Will the Hon. Minister for Registration, Endowments and Transport be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact, that weavers in Nedunkuli village near Wandiwash on 25th May protested against the entry of Harijans into a temple when celebrating the marriage of a Harijan in the village temple and observed hartal;

(b) whether police aid was given to celebrate the marriage of the Harijan in the village temple; and

[22nd November 1955]

(c) whether any action has been taken against the weavers and temple authorities under the Temple Entry Authorization Act and Removal of Civil Disabilities Act?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : (a) There is no village of the name of Nedunkuli in Wandiwash taluk. On 25th May 1955, a temple in Nedungunam village of that taluk was thrown open to Harijans, in the presence of some prominent persons, and the occasion was also availed of by the local Harijans to celebrate the wedding of a Harijan Engineering graduate at the temple. The Member is presumably referring to this matter. It has been reported that the temple authorities fully co-operated with the Harijans on the occasion and that though the weavers of Nedungunam did not quite relish the celebration, they did not give vent to their feelings in any manner.

(b) No, Sir.

(c) Does not arise.

(Starred question No. 2738 postponed to to-morrow.)

Starting of heavy industries

* 2739 Q.—SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIYAR : Will the Hon. the Minister for agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) the number and names of the heavy industries proposed to be started in the State and submitted to the Central Government by the State Government during the years 1947–54;

(b) whether any sanction was accorded to start any of these industries;

(c) whether any proposals for the starting of heavy industries in the State have been sent for inclusion in the Second-Five Year Plan; and

(d) if so, what they are and what their cost is?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : (a) The State Government did not draw up and submit during the period 1947–54 any detailed scheme to establish heavy industries in Madras State. But they requested the Government of India to investigate the possibility of setting up in South India an iron and steel industry to utilise the iron ore found in Salem district with the help of lignite from South Arcot district and also an aluminium industry to utilise bauxite found in the Shevaroy Hills in Salem district

(b) No, Sir.

(c) & (d) Apart from the integrated lignite scheme at Neyveli which is expected to be implemented by the Government of India, proposals for the establishment of the following heavy

22nd November 1955]

industries have been included in the draft Second-Five Year Plan for Madras State forwarded to the Planning Commission for consideration :

Name of Schedule	Total cost RUPEES IN LAKHS.)
1 Manufacture of aluminium and products of aluminium	898.68
2 Pilot blast furnace for utilising the Salem iron ore	207.00
3 Manufacture of Special and alloy steels	152.40
4 Unit for the manufacture of steel casting and forgings	176.00
5 Manufacture of electrical transformers and switch gears	250.0
6 Manufacture of sulphuric acid and fertilizer using gypsum	52.40

* 2740 Q.—(Postponed to to-morrow).

The Fertilizers and Chemicals Limited, Travancore

* 2741 Q.—SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) the total amount paid by the State Government towards shares in Fertilizers and Chemicals, Travancore, Limited;

(b) when the amount was paid;

(c) the net amount realised if any, by way of dividend or otherwise so far;

(d) the present market value of the said shares; and

(e) with what object the shares were originally subscribed to?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : (a) A sum of Rs. 41 lakhs was paid by the Composite Madras State and the Ex-Pudukkottai State, out of which Rs. 25,69,330 is treated as the share of the present Madras State.

(b) The amount was paid partly in 1945-46 and partly in 1948-49.

(c) Rs. 1,02,500.

(d) Rs. 6-6-0 per share of the value of Rs. 10.

(e) The shares were originally subscribed with the object of ensuring to the agriculturist of this State an adequate supply of ammonium sulphate, a chemical manure.

(Starred question No. 2742 postponed to to-morrow.)

Minister's visit to Attappady

* 2743 Q.—SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN (on behalf of Sri K. C. Gopalan Unni) : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Hon. Minister for Religious Endowments and Transport visited Attappady in Mannarghat Firka, Malabar in April 1955;

[22nd November 1955]

(b) whether the Local M.L.A. was given intimation about his visit; and

(c) the purpose of the visit?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: (a) No. He could not proceed to Attapaddy as programmed owing to heavy rain.

(b) Yes.

(c) To know the difficulties of the Hill-tribes and backward classes and others living there and to find out whether the road was fit for bus traffic.

Community Project Training Centre at Parli

* 2744 Q.—SRI K. C. GOPALAN UNNI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is any proposal to shift the Community Project Training Centre from Parli; and

(b) if so the reasons therefore and the place to which it is proposed to be shifted?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM: (a) & (b) The question was considered and it has been decided to retain the Training centre at Parli at present with reference to the number of candidates to be trained for the several regions.

* 2745 Q.—SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is any proposal under the consideration of the Government to transfer the Gramsevak Training Centre from Parli, South Malabar, to any other place; and

(b) if so, for what reasons?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM: (a) & (b) The attention of hon. Member is invited to the answer given to a similar question by Sri K. C. Gopalan Unni (2744).

* 2746 Q.—SRI K. P. GOPALAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Government have decided to shift the Gramasevak Training Centre from Parli in Palghat taluk, South Malabar to Bhavanisagar; and

(b) if so, the reasons therefor?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM: (a) & (b) The attention of hon. Member is invited to the answer given to a similar question by Sri K. C. Gopalan Unni (2744).

22nd November 1955]

Non-gazetted officers

* 2747 Q.—SRI A. RATNAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any memorandum from the Non-gazetted officers and whether a deputation on their behalf waited on the Chief Minister on 10th March 1955 to request the Government to raise their scales of pay and dearness allowance to those of Non-gazetted officers of the Union Government;

(b) whether there is any proposal under the consideration of the Government to appoint a Committee to go into their service conditions;

(c) whether there are any proposals under the consideration of Government like assignment of house sites to Non-gazetted officers grant of interest free-loans for construction of houses and removal of restrictions in regard to medical concessions;

(d) whether the resolutions passed at the 33rd session of the Conference of the Madras State Non-gazetted officers at Cuddalore in the month of May 1955 have been received by the Government;

(e) if so, what action has been taken by the Government thereon; and

(f) whether there is a proposal under the consideration of the Government to create a separate constituency for Non-gazetted officers in the Legislature?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: (a) Yes.

(b) No.

(c) No.

(d) Yes.

(e) They are being examined by the Government in the department concerned.

(f) No.

MR. SPEAKER: Question time is over.

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—ADJOURNMENT MOTIONS *RE*

(1) FAILURE OF THE GOVERNMENT TO TAKE ACTION *re*
ELECTION IRREGULARITY IN PANAPPUZHA PANCHAYAT AT
PRESIDENT'S ELECTION.

MR. SPEAKER: I have received the following adjournment motion from Sri K. P. Gopalan:—

“ This House stands adjourned to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, viz., the action on the part of the Returning Officer, one Sri T. K. Vasudevan Nair, in declaring a defeated candidate in the recent panchayat president's election, which election

10-20
a.m.

[Mr. Speaker] [22nd November 1955]

was by show of hands, in Panappuzha amsam of Chirakkal taluk, North Malabar, as the duly elected president and the failure of the Government to enquire into the matter and take action against the said officer which is causing commotion among the public in this area."

The election is over. I would like to know from the hon. Member how he calls it an urgent matter.

SRI K. P. GOPALAN : Mr. Speaker, Sir, the election of the panchayat president took place on 17th October 1955 in Panappuzha Amsam of Chirakkal taluk. The election was conducted by show of hands. The result was that the Congress candidate, one of the biggest landlords in that place secured votes as against the United Front candidate who secured votes. The Returning Officer announced this result. After the announcement of the result, the people dispersed. But on the evening of the same day the Returning Officer issued a notification to the effect that the candidate, who was declared defeated, had won and that he was the duly elected president of the panchayat board. The entire population in the Payyanur Constituency was surprised at this notification. The election was conducted openly, thousands of people witnesses it and heard the announcement of the result in the morning. They were surprised at the notification issued in the evening countermanding the result announced in the morning. Whoever wins in the election is a different matter. But if officials take a partisan attitude in the elections, it will be a menace to the growth of democracy in the country. My opinion is that officials must be above party politics and party prejudices. I myself and some other people represented to the Government to conduct an enquiry into the matter and take drastic action against the Returning Officer. But the Government were indifferent; they did not make any departmental or other enquiry. That is why I brought this matter to the notice of the House. This is a very serious matter. People should respect Government institutions. If an officer acts in the manner that the Returning Officer in question has acted, it will affect the prestige of the Government and undermine the people's faith in the Government, and it is against the democratic principles which we follow. That is why I think it is a matter of urgent public importance.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sir, this adjournment motion is misconceived, and I do not think it can be brought before this House. An election officer discharges certain statutory functions. If he misbehaves or there are any irregularities in the election, there are other remedies open to the candidates. The matter can be raised in a Court of law. As has already been pointed out by you, Mr. Speaker, I do not think under any circumstances this matter can be considered as urgent, because the election is over. If there is any irregularity, it can be considered only by a Court of law, even the Government cannot interfere. However, since a Government official is involved, we have asked the Inspector

22nd November 1955] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

of Local Boards to make an enquiry and submit a report. Considering this and the fact that his object in sponsoring this motion has been achieved, I hope the hon. Member will not press his motion.

SRI K. P. GOPALAN : As the Hon. Minister said that he had already asked the Inspector of Local Boards to make an enquiry and submit a report, I do not propose to move the motion.

(2) COERCIVE ACTION AGAINST PEASANTS FOR ALLEGED USE OF CANAL WATERS IN THE LOWER BHAVANI AREA.

MR. SPEAKER : I have received notice of an adjournment motion from Mr. K. T. Raju which reads as follows :—

“ This House stands adjourned to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, viz., the serious situation in the Lower Bhavani Project area of Erode taluk due to the large-scale coercive proceedings by the Revenue authorities against peasants and confiscation of their properties for alleged utilization of canal waters out of ayacut area without even giving them an opportunity to appeal against these unjust levies to the higher authorities and secure justice.”

I feel that the motion is vague and that it relates to a matter coming under the normal day-to-day administration of the Government. I shall be glad if the hon. Member will say how it is admissible.

* **SRI K. T. RAJU :** கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்த விஷயத்தை இந்த சபையின் கவனத்திற்கு கொண்டுவந்த காரணம், இது ஒரு பிரத்தியேகமான சூழ்நிலை. குறிப்பாக ஈரோடு தாலுக்காவுக்கு லோயர் பவானி அணைக்கட்டிலிருந்து சென்ற வருஷம் தண்ணீர் விட்டார்கள், அந்த சமயத்தில் இதுதான் ஆயக்கட்டு நிலம், இது ஆயக்கட்டு நிலமல்ல என்ற விவரத்தை சொல்லாமல் தண்ணீர் விட்டார்கள். தண்ணீர் விட்டு மூன்று மாதத்திற்கு பின்புதான் water permit கொடுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. ஆயக்கட்டுக்கு சேர்ந்திராத சில நிலங்களுக்கு அங்கிருக்கும் ஜனங்கள் அந்த தண்ணீரை உபயோகப்படுத்தி இருக்கிறார்கள். அப்படி உபயோகப்படுத்தினவர்களுக்கு இன்றைக்கு தண்டத் தீர்வை ஏராளமாக போட்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அந்த தண்டத் தீர்வையை எதிர்த்து சம்பந்தப்பட்ட அதிகாரிகளுக்கு அப்பீல் செய்ய அவகாசம் கொடுக்கப்படவில்லை. இந்த விஷயத்தில் சர்க்கார் முடிவு செய்யும் வரையில் stay order போடவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக் கொண்டதற்கும், சம்பந்தப்பட்ட ரெவின்யூ அதிகாரிகள் கவனிக்கவில்லை. கசிந்து வரும் தண்ணீரையும், வீணாக சிதறிப் போகும் தண்ணீரையும் அங்கிருக்கும் விவசாயிகள் உபயோகப்படுத்தி இருக்கிறார்கள். அந்த இடமெல்லாம் புதிய இடம், விவசாயிகளுக்கு காலாகாலத்தில், இந்த நிலங்கள்தான் ஆயக்கட்டில் சேர்ந்ததென்று, தெரிவிக்காததால், விவசாயிகள் விஷயம் தெரியாமல் சிதறி வரும் தண்ணீரை தங்களிடையே நிலங்களுக்கு உபயோகப்படுத்தி இருக்கிறார்கள். இப்படி தண்ணீரை உபயோகப்படுத்தியதற்காக 5 ரூபாய் 10 ரூபாய் மட்டுமல்ல, 1,500, 3,000 ரூபாய் வரையில், தண்டத் தீர்வை போட்டு, அதைக் கட்ட அவகாசம்கூட கொடுக்காமல் பல ஆடு மாடுகளை அசுந்தகாக ஜப்தி செய்திருக்கிறார்கள். ஆகையினாலே, கனம் மந்திரியார் அவர்களை என்ன கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுமோ என்றால், இந்த விஷயம், அதாவது லோயர் பவானி project அந்த பாகத்தில் சென்ற மூன்று நான்கு வருஷங்களாகத்தான் பரிசீலனையில்

10-25
a.m.

[Sri K. T. Raju] [22nd November 1955]

இருக்கிறது. இதை சர்க்காரும் ஒப்புக்கொள்ளுகிறார்கள். ஆகவே, அது புதிய பிரதேசம், ஆரம்பத்திலேயே, விவசாயிகளுக்கு இப்படிப்பட்ட கடுமையான தண்டத் தீர்வை போடுவது சரியல்ல. அத்துமீறி தண்ணீரை உபயோகப்படுத்தி இருந்தால் அவர்கள் குற்றம் செய்ததாகச் சொல்லலாம். ஒரு சின்ன மதகு, 25 ரூபாய்கூட அதன் கிரயம் ஆகாது. அப்பேர்ப்பட்ட மதகை யாரோ உடைத்ததற்காக, 1,500 ரூபாய் அங்கிருக்கும் விவசாயிகளுக்கு தண்டத் தீர்வை விதித்திருக்கிறார்கள். இப்படி விவசாயிகளைக் கொடுமை படுத்துவது சரியல்ல. கனம் அமைச்சர் அவர்கள், சர்க்கார் இது விஷயமாக பரிசீலித்து ஒரு முடிவுக்கு வரும் வரையில், தண்டத் தீர்வைக்காக ஜப்தி செய்து வருவதற்குத் தற்காலீகமாக நிறுத்தி வைப்பதற்காக ஒரு உத்திரவு பிறப்பிக்கவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : I have to submit, Sir, that this motion will not come under adjournment motion. If the hon. Member switches it off to one under rule 40, I am prepared to make a statement.

SRI K. T. RAJU : I have no objection, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER : The Hon. Minister may make a statement to-morrow.

Discussion on the report of the States Reorganization Commission will continue. Dr. K. B. Menon will now speak.

III.—REPORT OF THE STATES RE ORGANIZATION COMMISSION, 1955 (DISCUSSION.—cont.)

* DR. K. B. MENON : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise, if the Hon. Speaker would permit me to move my amendment to the Resolution that was moved by the Hon. the Leader of the House yesterday, for I may not be able to be present throughout the discussion for personal reasons. Whatever I say, I say it with a sense of responsibility and if I am not here to hear the answer of the Hon. the Finance Minister and the Leader of the House, he should not think that I am negligent, that I am irresponsible and that I am running away from the reality.

We would have been more happy, more jubilant, more helpful and more hopeful in criticising the States Reorganization Commission Report if we were confident that our constructive criticisms offered on the floor of the House would receive the weighty consideration that the views of the Opposition should receive from the Party in power. But reading the reports in the newspapers—and probably the Hon. the Leader of the House may object to it—about the proceedings of the Congress Working Committee on the 8th and 9th of this month, one feels rather disappointed, dejected and depressed in offering one's criticism about the States Reorganization Commission Report on the floor of a responsible Assembly. If we are made to feel that the decisions have already been taken, that the imposition of the Report is a foregone conclusion and that the invitation to the Members to discuss the Report is only affording an opportunity for them to let off steam, I am

22nd November 1955] [Dr. K. B. Menon]

sorry that that situation could very well have been saved by the Congress. The reported statement of the Prime Minister made at the meeting of the Congress Working Committee that it was better for the representatives to quietly accept the Report or that if they failed to do so, it would be imposed by him is a statement which staggers the nation. Claiming to be a democrat and going about the world as a proud representative of the biggest and the best democracy, if he makes such a statement, one is surprised to hear him say that in an affair which should be dealt with not at the Party level. It is an issue which is going to determine the fate of the whole of India for centuries to come. In an affair of that kind it is, to say the least, very disappointing to hear him say that he would impose it if it is not submissively accepted. The Congress Working Committee is a political caucus and when a political caucus assumes the responsibility of a supreme elected body in the State, one feels again disappointed about the future of our democracy. I wish that that kind of a situation or impression was avoided by the Prime Minister.

Coming to the Report itself, whatever the Hon. the Leader of the House might have said yesterday, I still wish to state that it could have been delayed, that the Congress is showing indecent haste in pushing it through, that it could have bided time, allowed passions and emotions to settle down and selected a better time when it could be discussed without rousing passions and emotions. The division of the country into the States that are there to-day has a history that dates back to a couple of centuries, to the days of British administration, and it has worked fairly well whatever be its defects for these two centuries. I see no reason why it cannot be worked for another couple of decades giving the nation a better chance to discuss the Report and creating a better situation to implement it. I also feel that the fate of the country should not have been left in the hands of three members of a Commission. I also feel that the Commission has not stuck to the terms of reference that were given to it. The safety, unity and security of the State were given supreme importance in the terms of reference to the Commission. That, I feel, has been completely neglected. I feel also that whatever the Commission may say and whatever lip objections it may raise to the linguistic division of the country, basically the division has been effected on the linguistic ground. With the exception of two States, namely, Pepsu and Bombay, the division of the rest of the country has been on a linguistic basis. There also it may be revised. But whatever it may be, that is the main basis on which the division has been made. I feel that that is very unfortunate. I see a family resemblance between the demand for a linguistic division of the State and the demand made in the early days of the struggle by Mr. Jinnah for a division of the State on a religious basis. Hindu India was shocked and surprised when Mr. Jinnah supported by Dr. Ambedkar and a great statesman of the South said that a division should be made on the ground that the Muslims were not safe in the hands of the Hindus. To-day whatever lip loyalty

[Dr. K. B. Menon] [22nd November 1955]

we may show, however much we may say that we do not want a linguistic division and that we stand for the unity of India and whatever lip service we may do to that unity, the fact remains that one language group does not feel safe to live in the State of another language group.

10-40
a.m.

When a Tamil language speaking person or villager does not feel safe in the Kerala State and a few Kerala State people do not feel safe in Tamilnad, I do not know where our Union is drifting to. I wish to repeat over and over again that it is just like saying that "Brutus was an honourable man", that our Union should survive, etc. If this report of the States Reorganization Commission is implemented, it is like releasing the evil spirits in Pandora's Box. We will be unleashing passions emotions in this country which it will be difficult for us to control. Already, even the announcement of the recommendations have created in different parts of the country a tension and a feeling that people are finding it difficult to control. It will be more so in the future as we progress in the implementation of the report. Therefore, my submission is that the report should be revised, that it should not be implemented as it is, that the basis of language must be shifted and that our primary consideration should be the unity, safety and security of a State.

I shall proceed next to a discussion of the report itself. I have fairly studied the report. If we take a cursory look at the map of India as divided by the States Reorganization Commission's report, it is obvious that the two or three giant states like the Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Bombay, cover nearly half the map of India and the remaining twelve or sixteen States are scattered in the south. I would ask the simple question "What are the repercussions of this on democracy?" I would like to maintain that the maintenance of such giant States controlling the major votes of the country is a denial or negation of democracy. If I quote figures (of course, I am quoting merely from memory), even to-day the State of Uttar Pradesh has 96 members in the Lok Sabha and 36 members in the Rajya Sabha. Nearly 100 members will be representing Madhya Pradesh and so, a couple of hundred votes in the Union Parliament controlled by these two States are going to determine the destiny of the country. What about the future of the Southern States? The Dravida Kazhagam was talking of the domination of the north over the south. It is the States Reorganization Commission that is now imposing the north over the south. As and when this unequal division into the States takes place, I am perfectly sure that the splintered votes of the south will be ineffective against the combined votes of the north. Now, we are quarrelling over trivials. I have heard the discussions in the House yesterday. We are quarrelling over boundary disputes which are after all insignificant. I am not perturbed by those responsible for the States Reorganization Report. I am not prepared as a Malayalee to fly at the throat of the Tamilians because I want this taluk, that village and so on. I stand for a more major issue. I would like to point out in this connection

22nd November 1955] [Dr. K. B. Menon]

to the Constitution of the United States or even the Constitution of the dictatorship of Russia or the Weimar constitution. In all these constitutions, provision is made for equalizing the votes of the State, for emphasising the voice of the small States. A similar provision was made in the Russian constitution. A similar provision was made even in the dictatorial Weimar constitution of which Hitler became the controlling hand. In India, we have no such safeguards. We have no equal rights for the States in the Council of States. The big States that will be controlling the destiny of the country will be dominating both in the Lok Sabha and in the Rajya Sabha. Where is democracy then? What is our future? What does citizenship mean if in our own country, if after having fought for the freedom of the country, if after making all the sacrifices that one should do as a nation, we are to barter it away because of the report of the States Reorganization Commission? We are asked to accept the report and if we do not accept it, we are told that it will be imposed on us. I wish to repeat, Sir, that this States Reorganization Report is sowing the seeds of disunity, discontent and disruption of the Union in the future.

Then, Sir, I am very sorry to say that the Hon. the Leader of the House, Sri Subramaniam, forgot in a fit of emotion, his sense of responsibility to the House and his responsibility to the State. I may also add that he forgot his sense of responsibility to the people of Malabar. I am talking with extreme sense of responsibility, not with passion, not with anger but with sorrow and sadness for, I think, that if he wanted to talk of Tamilnad and if he was very enthusiastic, I can very well understand it. Similarly, I have my own loyalty to Malabar. He should have remembered that Malabar to-day is an integral part of the Madras State and has been so for the last two centuries. Malayalees, whatever might have been their mistakes, acts of omission and commission the fact remains that they have tried to serve the State with loyalty for these two centuries. The minimum that they deserve is some consideration at this time when they are asked to leave their old homes. Whatever be the conditions, they should not be made to feel that Madras State has forgotten them, that Madras State is not fair and just to them. Sri Subramaniam, when he talked yesterday, brought in certain arguments. I am prepared to discuss with him and prove to him that he was not quite fair. I would have understood all that if he had not attempted to introduce the States Reorganization Report and moved the resolution of acceptance. As the head of the State and as an important executive arm of the State, I think, he should simply have moved it and said nothing more. But, I would have preferred that no Member of the Cabinet had talked in that strain about Malabar because, after all, they should accept that Malabar to-day is a part of the Madras State, that Malabar holds nothing against Tamilnad. If we face that problem from that humanitarian point of view, I am quite sure that Mr. Subramaniam would not have said what he said yesterday.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: May I know to what exact suggestion which I made, the hon. Member is objecting to?

10-50
a.m.

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [22nd November 1955]

As far as I could recollect, I have not made any suggestion which would jeopardise or injure or prejudice the position of Malabar either in this State or in the future Kerala State. If he is taking objection to what I stated with regard to Peermade and Devikulam, it is not a matter concerning Malabar as such.

* DR. K. B. MENON : I want to avoid getting into the details but I would have preferred to discuss it with Sri Subramaniam over a cup of tea at a table. I am prepared to defend it there and if I am at fault, I am prepared to say : ' I have made a mistake and I am sorry about it. Please pardon me '. I am absolutely willing to do it. As I have already stated, I am not speaking with passion or emotion. I have questioned the very basis of the Report of the States Reorganization Commission and I have stated that the linguistic division is wrong and that it should not be there. After hearing the whole argument yesterday, if only we had a machine to record the rising tempo, emotion and passion exhibited in this House, we would have felt how the Tamilians were feeling and how the Malayalees were feeling. I was quietly watching it and I did not even ask that embarrassing question which the hon. Leader of the Opposition put—not because it did not suggest to me but because I did not want to embarrass him and the public.

Argument was also advanced on the ground of administrative convenience. Malabar has been included in the Madras State for administrative convenience for the last two centuries and to-day for the same administrative convenience, it has been argued that part of Malabar must be taken over to the Tamilnad. I personally have no objection to it if the facts justify it. As I said before, I am opposed to the very fundamental principle of dividing States on a linguistic basis, for which I shall give many reasons. In order to suit his own desire to serve the Tamil people, I understand, he dwelt on the theory of self-sufficiency and said that the Tamil Nad has no forest areas and so they must go to Tamil Nad. Sir, these are very dangerous theories to project. These indicate dangerous tendencies. If we are going to develop that theory, that every State in the Union should be self-sufficient, I think, that itself will lead us to logical conclusions which we ourselves may not be willing to accept.

As far as the southern portion of the Travancore-Cochin State is concerned, I am not in a position to say anything definitely about it because I have no information. But I know every foot of Malabar and the Madras State and from that I also know that from the place " Top Slip " near the Coimbatore district, water has to be diverted to Coimbatore for drinking purposes. I will have no objection and I will be the first person to continue that facility if that is necessary. There is also one place called " Muthukulam ", about which there is a lot of controversy. Sri Kumaraswami Rajah himself visited that place. When Rajaji was the Chief Minister of this State, I suggested to him that water that is not needed in Malabar should be diverted to Tamil Nad. I am saying this on authority and I can show it in the proceedings

22nd November 1955] [Dr. K. B. Menon]

of this House. Therefore, it is a matter about which we can sit and discuss at a round table and thrash out things. These are not matters about which emotion need be whipped up. The Hon. Leader of the House was very silent about the Gudalur taluk until the issue was raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. So, in the presentation of the Report, he was not very fair to Malabar. If there is any difficulty, that could be solved. Sir, Malabar is opposed to the linguistic division of States because Malayalees are the smallest of the thirteen linguistic groups in India. If India is divided on a linguistic basis, the Kerala State will be the smallest State in the country and it can never be a viable unit. We protested against the linguistic division as early as 1948 because 13.6 million people will have to huddle together in about 14,000 square miles of territory. Tamil Nad has an area of about 50,000 square miles and its 30 million people can afford to be generous to the Kerala State with a crowded population and limited territory. Even in these 14,000 square miles of territory, much of it is taken by hills and dales, where it is not possible for the people to live in. They do not have a standing room—let alone a living space—and that is the main reason why the people of Malabar are objecting to this linguistic division and claiming that if the Kerala State is to be formed, as far as conditions would permit, it should be as big as possible. That is why we have advocated the formation of a West Coast State. Once we also talked of the Travancore-Cochin State merging with the Madras State.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI: Sir, having heard Mr. Menon so much, I would request him to clarify one point, viz., whether the views that he is expressing on the floor of this House also represent the views of the Party of which he is a distinguished Member.

* DR. K. B. MENON: I said in the very beginning that I am not speaking my personal view because personal views do not count or count very little. I have some authority at my back and as a responsible member of my Party, I certainly voice the opinion of the Party and also—as far as I can sense it—the voice of the people of Malabar. I suppose that satisfies the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

I think I have made the position very clear as to why we are opposed to the linguistic division and why we want a West Coast State or some larger State where we will have at least standing room and I say that the Kerala State is not a viable unit. Therefore, as long as we are part of India and as long as we are within the Union, it is the responsibility of the Centre to definitely come forward and say and incorporate in the Constitution that they are responsible for the full growth and development of the Kerala State. The natural and human resources of Malabar alone will not have any opportunity of expression unless these conditions are satisfied. With these words, I move my amendment, viz.,

“Add at the end the following:—

‘and on such consideration this House rejects the same.’”

The amendment was duly seconded.

[22nd November 1955]

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM: Mr. Speaker, Sir, under ordinary circumstances I would have spoken only on the last day of the discussion. But I preferred to speak to-day for various reasons. Sir, I was cautiously following what Dr. Menon was saying about the States Reorganization Commission Report. May I submit not only to men of his type but also to those who talk of unity and safety of this country that it is too late now to say anything against the States Reorganization Commission Report. The division of the country on linguistic basis has come to stay and it is going to be achieved before we face the electorate during the coming general elections. But my personal view about this report is that no useful purpose will be served by any discussion on it for it is the Congress High Command that decides the issues raised in the report for our country and any discussion either in the local Assemblies or even in the Parliament only amounts to a political farce. Even the Parliament has been neglected. Sir, to counteract my arguments, the exponents of the Congress Party may say that after all it is the majority party that rules and decides the issues for the country.

Sir, I view this entire report from a Tamilian point of view. Let me make it very clear that point and I am not hiding the aspect in which I look at this report. The Members who constituted this Commission are no-doubt eminent men. I do not question their political honesty or sagacity. When matters relating to Bihar were discussed, Sir Fazl Ali, an eminent jurist who was the Chairman of the Commission was kind enough to withdraw from the discussion so that his personal touch would not have much bearing on the report. Likewise, Sri K. M. Panikkar, whose honesty I do not doubt and for whose political sagacity I take my hat off, should have withdrawn from the discussion whenever matters concerning Malabar and Madras were discussed. But, Sir, for what reasons he took part in the discussions, though as a Member of the Commission it was his personal right to take part in the discussions, I do not know. If he had withdrawn from the discussion, then there would not have been much room to suspect as to how the report has been drafted, as for instance when matters concerning Devikulam and Peermade were discussed. I will tackle this report as a whole and not as a contribution of Mr. Panikkar in the report. There are contradictory statements in many places in the report. To quote a Biblical saying that even a Devil will quote scriptures to suit its own purposes, wherever linguistic majorities suited the purpose of the Commission they have said that it is the language that decides and wherever it goes against the interests of certain individuals or States in whom they are interested they have said that language should not be the main criterion to decide the future of that particular area. In this connection, particular reference may be made about Devikulam taluk. Under what principle the five southernmost taluks are proposed to be merged with the Madras State? It is purely on the language basis. But when it is the case of Devikulam, the Commission argues that the Tamilian population in that taluk is a floating

22nd November 1955] [Sri K. Vinayakam]

population. After the arguments ably advanced by the Hon. Leader of the House, I do not think that I will enrich the debate by reiterating his own arguments. He has ably argued that the floating population theory is a nebulous one and that it has no political conception. People who have been living in that area for the last 20 or 30 years cannot be considered as floating population. They have found their places in the electoral rolls and they have sent their own representatives to the local Assembly. It is too late for the Commission to talk of floating population. The Census figures for the past thirty years definitely go to show that there has been infiltration more from Travancore State into this area rather than from the Madras State into this area under reference. I am to understand that even the State language in Travancore before 50 years was Tamil. It is evidenced by the State Gazettes. Sri Nagam Ayya's Travancore State Manual makes it clear that the administrative language of Travancore-Cochin State was Tamil before 50 years. So, the infiltration has come more from the West rather than from the East. Even the geographical environment goes to show that the terrain slowly ascends from the East towards the West in Devikulam and Peermede taluks and on the western side it is a steep descent towards the West. Even the geographical surroundings strengthen our argument that Devikulam and Peermede have got to go with the Madras State.

Now I come to Neyyathinkara and Chittur areas. Proper evidence was let in before the Commission by the leaders of the Travancore-Tamilnad Congress Committee that these areas should go to the Madras State. Before the census of those areas was taken, the T.T.N.C. leaders had been going about telling the Tamilian population to register themselves as Tamilians and not classify themselves as Malayalees. But the Government there launched cases against such propagandists and relevant evidence was let in before the Commission in this connection. But the Commission brushed aside their evidence and used nebulous arguments saying that the population figures are in favour of Malayalees. Similarly in the case of Chittur taluk, we are not claiming the entire taluk but only the eastern portion of Chittur taluk abutting Coimbatore district which is predominantly a Tamil area. There are 19 villages which are predominantly Tamilian in character. I had the opportunity of visiting this area. The western area has a predominantly Malayalee population. We will be asking too much if we claim the entire Chittur taluk. We are only asking that portion of Chittur taluk which is predominantly a Tamil area. Sir, our friends from Malabar district are all thinking that we are claiming too much when we say that Tamil areas of Palghat taluk should be added on to this State. When we have decided to divide the country on language basis, it is nothing but logic, it is nothing but fair-play that contiguous areas which are predominantly Tamilian in character should be added on to this State. Some of us who have toured these areas have come to the conclusion that from Palghat towards the east it is a

[Sri K. Vinayakam] [22nd November 1955]

11-10
a.m. contiguous area abutting Coimbatore district and this is predominantly a Tamil area. Necessary steps have got to be taken by the Government to include such Tamil areas. Sir, I would have been glad if the Government had come forward with an official resolution agreeing with the sum total of this Report, at the same time requesting the Central Government to appoint a Boundary Commission for getting the Tamil areas annexed to the Madras State. I do not know why they have not brought a resolution of this type. In the Andhra Assembly, the Government there are bringing such a resolution. In the Travancore-Cochin Assembly also, a similar resolution is being moved. In the Mysore Assembly they have attempted to move a resolution of this kind. I am at a loss to understand why the Madras Government are hesitating to bring in such a resolution.

After perusing the entire Report, I came to the conclusion that from the point of view of the Tamilians, this Report has done great injustice to us and is a document of political dishonesty. When linguistic States are being formed all over the country, why should the same privilege be denied to Madras State? I would have welcomed if the Commission had suggested that Madras State should be named as "Tamil Nad" or "Tamilagam" after the linguistic division. Our State should be named after our language. I have seen some Cabinet Ministers of very good reputation going about and saying "What is the glamour attachment to the name 'Tamil Nad'?" They further say "We would rather prefer to have this State called as Madras State". May I submit, Sir, in all humility that it does no credit to us to still retain the name of Madras. Madras is the name of a foreigner, a Dutch settler. I would request the Hon. the Leader of the House to go through the records that are in the possession of the Government to find out how this place acquired the name of Madras. The Government have issued a pamphlet and the Corporation of Madras have also issued a pamphlet over this matter. There are records which go to prove that Madras is the name of a Dutch settler. They are trying to camouflage the issue. I would request the Government to prevail upon the Central Government that our State should be named under the name and style of "Tamil Nad". Now I come to more interesting subjects as far as I am concerned.

I draw the attention of the hon. the Leader of the House to paragraphs 395 and 396 of the Report which deal with the northern boundaries of our State. The Report makes it clear that in pursuance of the statement made by the Prime Minister on the floor of Parliament on March 25, 1953, a Boundary Commission will be appointed to demarcate the boundaries between the two States, namely, Madras and Andhra. They have also suggested that if agreement could be reached by mutual talks between the two Governments, the boundary issue may be settled, but in the event of a failure to come to an agreement, the Central Government will come forward to appoint a Boundary Commission. This is a vexatious problem. This problem has been hanging in the air for the past two years and what steps our Government have taken the

22nd November 1955] [Sri K. Vinayakam]

country is not aware of. But some steps have been taken in this regard, namely, the appointment of a Superintendent to re-sort the census slips on the basis of the 1951 census and graphs and maps have been drawn so far as the disputed areas are concerned. Only when people agitate in the country and only when the Government come to know that people are impatient about solving the problem the Government seem to move in the direction. The Report states that the Commission will not express any opinion as long as the two Governments are negotiating between themselves to solve this problem. But what are the steps which our Government are taking? They have taken two years to draw these charts and maps. Re-sorting of census slips has been completed. Only last month, I believe, the representatives of the Andhra and Madras Governments met together in Madras. It was made clear to us on the floor of this House when we met last time that the talks would be at the ministerial level. That means that no outsider or non-official will be allowed to take part in the talks. On behalf of the Madras Government, three eminent Ministers took part in the talks but from the Andhra side besides three Ministers, a non-official also participated. I was told that he is the Leader of the Congress Party of Andhra Desa and that gentleman was allowed to participate in the talks to support the arguments advanced by the Andhra Ministers. Sir, I take a very strong attitude in this matter. It amounts to belittling the prestige of our State. When the Madras Ministers did not take any non-official to advise them on this issue, they should not have allowed a non-official from the Andhra side to take part in the discussion. Having known the Andhras pretty well, having lived with them for so many years and having known their outlook well, I know that all these talks will come to a deadlock. During my private conversation with the Hon. the Chief Minister and the Hon. the Leader of the House, I told them that their talks will end in a deadlock. I know what the Andhras are. They have argued the case of Hosur during the talks. I am sure that our Government should not have allowed that topic to be discussed. What for were they meeting? They were meeting to solve their boundary dispute. Is the problem of Hosur a boundary dispute? Hosur is a taluk which is at one end of our State adjoining Mysore. When the representatives of Andhra raised this subject of Hosur, our Government must have taken a stiffer attitude and said "This is not a boundary dispute as far as you are concerned. This is a boundary dispute so far as the Mysore Government are concerned, if they raise it." That is the attitude which they should have taken. They should not have even gone into the merits of the question. They should not have talked about the percentage of the population of the various linguistic groups and about the contiguity of that area. All these things were unwarranted. They should have openly told the Andhra Ministers "It is not your business to talk about Hosur". They could have talked about Krishnagiri if they had a case. The Andhra Ministers are fully aware of the fact that they will not get even one village from the Krishnagiri taluk. Just to throw the responsibility on somebody else, the Andhras have invented this

[Sri K. Vinayakam] [22nd November 1955]

11-20
a.m.

curious argument of multi-lingual areas like Hosur. I was sure that neither the Madras Government nor the Andhra Government wanted to take the responsibility upon themselves to solve this problem. What is it they are doing? They are just manœuvring and playing a political game, telling the Central Government "We are friendly. We want to solve our problem between ourselves". That is the game which our Government and the Andhra Government are trying to play. They are not prepared to solve this problem. So I said even earlier that the Madras Government should write to the Central Government to appoint an impartial Boundary Commission, as the two Governments could not come to an agreement. Whatever may be the decision of that Commission, it will be final according to the statement made by the Prime Minister in Parliament in August 1953. I remember the Hon. Mr. Subramaniam in a statement on the floor of this House said that this Government would solve this problem by the end of this year. I may remind him that not more than forty days are there for the close of this year. From newspaper reports it appears that the Andhra Government have almost come to the conclusion that they are not going to negotiate with our Government and that they are going to write to the Central Government for the appointment of a Boundary Commission. The official resolution which the Andhra Government are bringing before the Andhra Assembly for consideration goes to show that they are not coming back to Madras for discussion. Let our Ministers be practical, let them wake up from their slumber and solve this problem quickly. I hope the Madras Government will not wait for the solution of this problem until there is an upsurge or unrest on the part of the affected people in the border areas.

I might bring to the notice of this House at this pertinent juncture that the Andhra Government are trying to terrorise the Tamilian population by making a claim for a larger area. When they say that they will take Hosur, Krishnagiri, Gudiyatham, Ponneri and Trivellore, no Tamilian need be disturbed over their tall claim. They are claims without any basis. The Madras Government have gone through the census slips and maps and they are in possession of full information. In Tiruttani taluk of Chittoor district, seventy-three per cent of the population are Tamilians and Tiruttani is almost entirely Tamilian. Even the rule of contiguity is satisfied. Inside the taluk, there are small Telugu-majority pockets here and there. But on the borders we have got villages with a vast Tamil-majority population. So no one need be alarmed over the Andhra Government's tall claim.

Coming to Chittoor, as we approach that town from Vellore, we are in a definite majority up to Chittoor. Even in Chittoor town, the Tamilians are four thousand more in number than the Telugus. The census slips have been prepared not by the Madras or the Andhra Government but by the Central Government and nobody need dispute the census figures. The leaders in Andhra Desa were under the impression that they were going to get more than what they were going to lose. That was the impression created in that

22nd November 1955] [Sri K. Vinayakam]

State. They went through the census slips, came to certain conclusions and found that, according to the mutual talks, they would have to give more portion than what they anticipated. They created a wrong impression and got into a mess. To get out of the mess and to see that they will not have any trouble in the forthcoming elections, they want to throw the responsibility on a boundary commission. As far as Chittoor is concerned, the Madras Government must take up a stiffer attitude. I do not want them to be intransigent or plead for unjust causes. The rule of contiguity also is satisfied. Chittoor must be ours under any circumstances. In Tiruttani taluk, we should claim up to the village of Puttur.

As regards Tirupati, I admit that the census figures show that the Tamilians are in a minority compared to the Telugu people. But that is due to infiltration from the north. But now we cannot be arguing as to who were infiltrating, who had been doing mischief and all these things. We shall take the present position as it is. The rights of the minority living in Tirupati have got to be safeguarded and we will provide the safeguard either by mutual settlement or through the agency of a boundary commission.

Our Government should have a voice in the administration of the temple at Tirupati. Tirupati temple is not the sole property of the Andhras alone. It is an All-India pilgrim centre and an All-India property. People from Tamil, Telugu, Karnataka and other areas visit the temple. So the Madras Government must adopt a very firm attitude and fight for the nomination of their representatives to the board of administration of the temple.

The Tirupati University is now fast becoming a Telugu University. The authorities are trying to oust our Tamil students. They have already closed the Tamil section this year. Till last year, they had a separate Chair for Tamil. This year they have abolished it. They know that there is a weak-kneed Government here and not a strong Government to fight for the cause of Tamilians living there. I find out leaders go about saying : Let us be very fair to the Telugus here. We are very fair. Who said that we are denying them any rights here? I have known some prominent leaders of the Telugu community in Madras convening meetings and saying that Telugu is in danger. This is nothing but bunkum. This is merely taking advantage of our weakness. I submit that the Madras Government should take serious steps for protecting the rights of the Tamilian minorities in the district.

I have given notice of three amendments to the motion. One proposes the naming of the State as " Tamil Nad ". I believe the Legislature Parties have given freedom of voting to their members. I understand from newspapers that the Congress Party has given freedom of voting to its members. I appeal to the Members of the Congress Party to avail themselves of that freedom and vote for this amendment.

[Sri K. Vinayakam] [22nd November 1955]

The next amendment is self-explanatory. Nobody could have done better justice than the Hon. Leader of the House as far as the disputed areas in the south and south-west are concerned.

Coming to the last amendment which stands in my name, I have advanced enough arguments to show that mutual talks which our Ministers are trying to have with the Andhra Ministers will always be beset with a deadlock. I believe the Andhra Ministers have promised that they will write to our Ministers before the end of November. They are too busy with Visalandhra and so they may not be concerned with the small disputed areas in the south. They are jubilant over their getting the Visalandhra. So they may even adopt an intransigent attitude towards the Tamil-Andhra border issues. There are hardly eight days before the close of this month. If our Government do not hear anything from the Andhra Government before the end of the month, they should write to the Central Government asking for the appointment of a boundary commission. I give the assurance on behalf of the people living in the disputed areas that the decision of the commission shall be accepted as final even if it is to the detriment of our interests. With these words I move—

Add at the end the following :—

“ and on such consideration this House recommends to the Central Government that with the implementation of the recommendations of the States Reorganization Commission, this State be named as ‘ Tamil Nad ’ instead of Madras State ”.

Add at the end the following :—

“ and on such consideration this House agrees with the recommendations of the States Reorganization Commission regarding the inclusion of the five taluks of Agastheeswaram, Thovala, Kalkulam, Vilavancode, Shencotta in Madras State and recommends to the Central Government to include the entire taluks of Devikulam and Peermade and predominantly Tamil-speaking areas of Neyyathinkara and Chittur of Travancore-Cochin State and Palghat taluks of Malabar district in the Madras State ”.

Add at the end the following :—

“ and on such consideration this House recommends to the Government of India to appoint an impartial boundary commission to settle the future of predominantly Tamil-speaking areas of Chittoor district of Andhra ”.

SRI K. R. SAMBANDAM : I second the amendments.

IV.—SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM : A large number of members are eager to participate in the discussion of the motion regarding the report of the States Reorganization Commission, and so there is a suggestion that the time allotted for this debate may be extended by one day. The suggestion was agreed to by the Hon. Leader of the House. May I know what his decision is?

22nd November 1955]

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Requests have been made that the debate should be extended by one day instead of having night sitting that we proposed to have to-day because it is very chill in the night. We have agreed to the extension of the debate by one day. Tomorrow, the other Members will speak and day after tomorrow the Leader of the Opposition will speak and I will reply on behalf of the Government.

SRI R. V. SWAMINATHAN : Sir, the amendments have not yet been formally moved.

DEPUTY SPEAKER : They have not been circulated. As soon as they are circulated, I shall ask the hon. Members to move them.

III.—REPORT OF THE STATES REORGANIZATION COMMISSION, 1955—cont.

SRI V. K. PALANISWAMY GOUNDER : கனம் உதவி சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, என்னுடைய தொகுதியும் மலபார் ஜில்லாவுக்கு பக்கத்திலே இருக்கிறது. மலபார் ஜில்லா மாத்திரம் பக்கத்தில் இருப்பதல்லாமல் **T.C. State** சித்தூர் தாலுக்காவும் அண்டையில்தானிருக்கிறது. இந்த இரண்டு பிரதேசங்களும் என் தொகுதியை ஒட்டினது போல் இருப்பதாலே எனக்கு அங்குள்ள விஷயம் தெரியுமென்று சொல்லிக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். இங்கே நாம் பேசும்போது அந்த எல்லையிலிருக்கும் மக்களுடைய மனப்பான்மையை நன்றாக புரிந்துகொள்வதில்லை. நாம் பெரிய நோக்குடன் பார்க்கிறோம். நமது ராஜ்யம் இந்திய யூனியனுக்குள்ளே இருக்கிறது. எல்லோரும் இந்தியாவின் பிரஜைகள் என்ற நோக்குடன் பார்த்தாலும் எல்லையிலிருக்கும் மக்கள் இதை ரொம்ப வேகமாக பார்க்கிறார்கள். நினைக்கிறார்கள். அது சகஜம்தான், அது அவசியமும் கூட. என் தொகுதிக்குப் பக்கத்திலே இந்த பாலக்காடு தாலுக்கா இருக்கிறது. அதாவது பொள்ளாச்சி தாலுக்கா பக்கத்திலே பொள்ளாச்சியிலிருந்து கொஞ்சம் கொஞ்சமாக உள்ளே போனால் ஒவ்வொரு கிராமமும், தமிழ் பேசும் பிரதேசமாக இருப்பதைப் பார்க்கலாம். முன்பு இருந்தே, இந்த ஜில்லாவின் எல்லைகள் மொழிவாரியாக அமைகப்படவில்லை. ஆகையினாலே தமிழ் பேசும் ஜனங்கள் அங்கு இருப்பது கண்கூடு. அவர்கள் எல்லோருக்கும் பொள்ளாச்சி தாலுக்காவிலிருக்கிற வர்களுடன் சம்பந்தம் உண்டு. வியாபாரம் மற்ற எல்லா வகையிலும் பொள்ளாச்சி தாலுக்கா, கோயம்புத்தூர் ஜில்லாவுடன் இணைத்திருக்கிறார்கள். இந்த பாலக்காடு தாலுக்காவில் ஒவ்வொரு கிராமமாக எடுத்துக்கொண்டு, தமிழ் அதிகமாக பேசப்படும் இடங்களை தமிழ் நாட்டுடனும், மலையாளம் அதிகமாக பேசப்படும் இடங்களை மலையாளத்துடனும் சேர்ப்பதுதான் ரொம்ப நியாயமானது. அத்தாலுக்காவில் கிராமவாரியாக, கணக்குப்புள்ளி விவரங்கள் எடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று நான் நினைக்கிறேன். கம்யூனிஸ்ட் கட்சியும் அந்தமாதிரி கிராமவாரியாக புள்ளி விவரமெடுத்து, அக்கிராமங்களை, அந்தந்த மொழிவாரி பகுதிகளில் சேர்த்துக்கொள்ளலாமென்று சொல்லிக்கொண்டிருக்கிறது. **S.R.C.** ரிப்போர்ட்டில், இந்தியா முழுவதும் சேர்த்து, கவனித்து இருப்பதால் ஒரு ஜில்லாவை **unit** ஆக எடுத்துக்கொள்ளலாமென்று ராஜ்ய சீரமைப்புக் கமிஷன் சொல்லி இருக்கிறது. பின்னால், அதே கமிஷன் தாலுக்காவுக்கு வந்தது, அதன்பின் பகுதிகளுக்கும் வந்தது. இந்தக் கமிஷன் ஒரே யோசனை, கொள்கையுடன் இந்த ராஜ்ய சீரமைப்பை செய்யவில்லை. பாலக்காடு தாலுக்காவை பொருத்தமட்டில், ஒவ்வொரு கிராமமாக புள்ளி விவரங்கள் எடுத்து, அந்தந்த மொழிவாரி பகுதிகளில், அக் கிராமங்களைச் சேர்க்கவேண்டுமென்று ஆசைப்படுகிறேன். இதைச் செய்வதில், ஒரு கஷ்டமும் இல்லை. இந்த அடிப்படையில் சில கிராமங்கள் தமிழ் நாட்டுடன் சேருவதால், எனக்கு முன் பேசிய தனம் மெம்பர் அவர்கள்

22nd November 1955]

V.—PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

1. Notification issued with G.O. Ms. No. 3265, Public (Services), dated 21st October 1955, amending the Madras Public Service Commission Regulations, 1954, bringing within the Commission's purview the temporary post of Resident Matron, Grade III, Health Unit, Poonamallee, in the Madras Health Subordinate Service. [Laid on the table under Article 320 (5) of the Constitution of India].
2. Pamphlet on "Facts about B.C.G. Vaccination" published by the Directorate-General of Health Services, New Delhi.
3. Report of the States Reorganization Commission, 1955.
4. Appropriation accounts of the State of Madras for 1952-53 and the Audit Report, 1954.
5. Notification issued with G.O. Ms. No. 2836, Home, dated 10th October 1955 regarding amendments to the Motor Vehicles Rules in regard to the fee for issue of certificate of fitness. [Laid on the table of the House under Section 133 (3) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939 (Central Act IV of 1939).]
6. Notification issued with G.O. Ms. No. 2639, Home, dated 28th September 1955 regarding amendment to the Motor Vehicles Rules in regard to the Appendix in Form T.S.S. [Laid on the table of the House under Section 133 (3) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939 (Central Act IV of 1939).]
7. Notification issued with G.O. Ms. No. 2766, Home, dated 6th October 1955, regarding exemption to the vehicle MSY 1714, belonging to the Regional Industrial Adviser (Technical Co-operation Mission), Madras, from payment of tax. [Laid on the table of the House under Section 11 (2) of the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931].
8. Notification issued with G.O. Ms. No. 2671, Home, dated 30th September 1955, exempting from tax the vehicles chartered by tourists. [Laid on the table of the House under Section 11 (2) of the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931].
9. Demands for Grants for further expenditure and detailed Supplementary Estimates thereof for the year 1955-56.
10. Notification issued with G.O. Ms. No. 3017, Home, dated 12th September 1955, regarding collection of tax at reduced rate for the vehicle MD-I 1649 belonging to Don Bosco Orphanage, Vellore. [Laid on the table of the House under Section 11 (2) of the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931].

[22nd November 1955]

APPENDIX.

[Vide answer to starred question No. 2704 asked by Sri A. Ratnam at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 22nd November 1955, page 143 supra.]

There was an agrarian dispute in April 1955 between the Harijan cultivators and the landowners of Mahadanapuram which is in Kulitalai taluk, Tiruchirappalli district. The dispute arose mainly on the share of waram paddy. There were also other minor disputes in the matter of payment of 'Swathanthiram', etc., in kind.

The dispute was settled by the Revenue Divisional Officer, Karur, on 28th April 1955. The terms of settlement are--

(i) that landlords should supply manure and the cultivating tenants should attend to all cultivation work and that the tenants shall get $3\frac{1}{4}$ marakkal for every kalam of paddy, after deducting harvesting charges, swathanthiram, etc.;

(ii) that the waramdars should give four bundles of straw for every acre of land to the landlord and that the balance should be divided equally between the landlord and the waramdar.

The Harijans have not boycotted Caste Hindus and refused to do any service to them. No such complaints have also been received from the Caste Hindus.

வாய்மையே வெல்லும்
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS